

Union, and other citizens of Ozark County, urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1521. Also, petition of 82 members of the Central Methodist Church of Webb City, Mo., urging the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, let us not be content to wait and see what will happen, but give us the determination to make the right things happen.

While time is running out, save us from patience which is akin to cowardice.

Give us the courage to be either hot or cold, to stand for something, lest we fall for anything.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 9, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 8, 1948:

S. 1195. An act to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations.

On March 9, 1948:

S. 703. An act to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors;

S. 1267. An act for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon; and

S. 1802. An act to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENTS OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK, AND NATIONAL HOUSING ACTS

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, and to amend section 19 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and subsection (c) of section 402 of the National Housing Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT CONCERNING COURTHOUSE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A report made to Congress pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80, Eightieth Congress, by the committee appointed thereunder, concerning the proposed construction of a building in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States Court of Appeals and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of S. B. Cooperthwaite, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of the so-called Marshall European recovery program; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the assembly of the Gran Logia, Regional No. 1, de la Orden Fraternal de Odd-Fellows Latinos, Rio Piedras, P. R., relating to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the National Antivice Crusade, with headquarters at Lincoln, Nebr., expressing their support of the so-called Capper bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter for appropriate reference and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL ANTIVICE CRUSADE,
Lincoln, Nebr., March 6, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We, the undersigned national officials for the organization known as the National Antivice Crusade, do tender to you for your records the following resolution:

Resolved, That we, the National Antivice Crusade of these United States of America, are in accord with the Capper bill to prohibit the advertising of all alcoholic beverages.

Authorized this 6th day of March by the official board of the National Antivice Crusade as by the president of said organization.

ISAAC B. FLINT
(Evangelist Isaac B. Flint),
First Vice President and
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

For the National Antivice Crusade:
Rev. EDGAR J. WRIGLEY,
President.

Rev. JOSEPH RICHARDS,
Executive Vice President.

WALLACE MEMMER,
Assistant Executive Vice President.

TAX AND CONTROLS ON BUTTER SUBSTITUTES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the Kansas Inter-Breed Dairy Cattle Council in special session February 25, 1948, at Manhattan, Kans., urging that the Congress keep the present tax and controls on butter substitutes in order that the best interests of the entire population be served over a long period of time. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by Kansas Inter-Breed Dairy Cattle Council in special session February 25, 1948, at Manhattan, Kans.

Whereas the State of Kansas ranks thirteenth in total milk production among the States of the Nation; and

Whereas the dairy industry is the third largest source of agricultural income in Kansas, with a total of about \$90,000,000 annually; and

Whereas 87 percent of the farmers of Kansas depend on the dairy business for a part of their income; and

Whereas the dairy industry is the largest single source of agricultural income exceeding wheat, cotton, and soybeans combined; and

Whereas the butter industry is the backlog of the dairy industry representing nearly half the total butterfat marketed; and

Whereas disturbance of the butter industry would seriously jeopardize the other phases of the dairy industry such as the marketing of milk, ice cream, etc., to the detriment of the nutritional welfare of the Nation and particularly such segments of the consuming public as children and pregnant mothers; and

Whereas the removal of taxes and other existing controls of butter substitutes threatens to seriously affect the welfare of a large segment of the agricultural population which represents all the best standards of agricultural community life, and also threatens to jeopardize the welfare of the consumer: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Inter-Breed Dairy Cattle Council, representing six dairy cattle breed associations in Kansas, go on record as urging the Congress of the United States to keep the present taxes and controls on butter substitutes in order that the best interests of the entire population may be best served over a long period of time. Particularly do we urge that the representatives of the State of Kansas in both the Senate and House be specially on guard that the best interests of Kansas which is primarily an agricultural and exporting State be served effectively.

Prof. F. W. ATKESON,
Chairman.
JOHN WEIR, JR.,
ROSS ZIMMERMAN,
Committee.

OPERATIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 132, Eightieth Congress, first session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report accompanied by an original bill relating to the operations of the Reconstruction Fi-

nance Corporation, and I submit a report (No. 974) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 2284. A bill to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2285. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees in navy yards; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 2286. A bill to provide for nonreimbursable allocations on the Carlsbad Federal reclamation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.)

(Mr. WILEY (by request) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 195, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim June 20, 1948, as Emblem Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

EMBLEM DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was on the 20th of June 1782 that the Continental Congress selected the American bald eagle as the official emblem of the United States of America. As every Senator knows, the bald eagle constitutes a part of the great seal of the American Republic, and also appears on the Presi-

dent's flag. This emblem is indeed a symbol of the American ideals of courage, trustworthiness, and ability to get things done. The eagle can fly above the storm and can see what goes on, so to speak. It was indeed a historic and striking event, when we contemplate it, when the founding fathers selected the bald eagle as an emblem of the young Republic.

All through the years of man's growth toward the light, Mr. President, man has indulged in the use of symbols. Back in the early days of the Christian era, we remember that the Christians would recognize each other by drawing a fish on the sand. We also remember that the church was symbolized by a ship, and that the peacock stood for immortality, and the phoenix for resurrection.

I may say, Mr. President, that there is in the United States a great organization known as the Eagles. This year they are celebrating their fiftieth birthday. Their national symbol is the American bald eagle. That organization is the only fraternal organization in the world bearing the name "Eagles," and whose cardinal principles are symbolized by the eagle.

Their principles are liberty, truth, justice, and equality. Judge Albert H. Schmidt, one of Wisconsin's distinguished citizens, residing at Manitowoc, is in the National Capital today. He is national chairman of the national emblem committee of the Grand Eyrie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. It was a Wisconsin idea—one of Wisconsin's many pioneering concepts—that there should be a National Emblem Day.

Mr. President, I am introducing a joint resolution at the request of my distinguished friend, and on behalf of the Eagles, an American patriotic institution that has stood foursquare for the things that we know comprise the American idea. I ask unanimous consent to introduce the joint resolution for appropriate reference, and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 195) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim June 20, 1948, as Emblem Day, introduced by Mr. WILEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the bald eagle, commonly known as the American eagle, was on the 20th day of June 1782 selected by the Continental Congress as the official emblem of the United States of America; and

Whereas the bald eagle thus became the symbolic representation of a new nation under a new government in a new world, imprinted on the Great Seal of the new Republic, carried in brass effigy above the colors, and appearing on the President's flag; and

Whereas the American bald eagle, by the act of that Congress, and by tradition and custom during the life of this Nation, has come to be recognized as a symbol of the American ideals of freedom: Therefore be it Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 20th day of June 1948 as Emblem Day, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, and inviting

the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the American eagle, the official emblem of the United States, and of the great principles and ideals which it represents and symbolizes, and to renew and rededicate their faith in such principles and ideals.

REDUCTION OF INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT AT PHILADELPHIA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the Taft-Hartley Act, delivered by Senator TAFT at the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum on March 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SOUTH AND THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued March 9, 1948, by Senator OVERTON regarding the attitude of the South toward the civil-rights program which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR HATCH'S MESSAGE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator Hatch's Message," from the Nashville Tennessean of March 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUSTICE FOR POSTMEN—EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE BANNER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Justice for Postmen," from the Nashville Banner of March 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—SUMMARY BY NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the Taft-Hartley Act, prepared by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSIONS

During the course of Mr. TAYLOR's speech, subsequently delivered,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for two or three unanimous-consent requests, with the understanding that he will not thereby lose the floor?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield on the suggestion of my friend the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the senior Senator from Idaho for the courtesy. I am sorry to interrupt him, but I wanted the unanimous-consent requests to appear at another place in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Exports of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business be permitted to meet this afternoon. There are several witnesses here from the Pacific coast who are anxious to start back tonight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in behalf of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee may meet this afternoon. Witnesses are present from a distance, and we should like to continue with the hearing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon and tomorrow during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee handling the independent offices bill is trying to get that bill ready for action on the Senate floor at the time when the debate on the ERP bill now before the Senate is concluded. In order to do so, we must work both mornings and afternoons. As chairman of that subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent that we may have the consent of the Senate to sit this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon, if necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the announcement made at the close of the session last night, about a quarter of seven, with respect to holding sessions of the Senate Thursday night and Friday night.

As I understand, at this time the Senate will proceed with the unfinished business, and, under the unanimous consent order, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] has the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, before I proceed with my prepared remarks, I should like to read into the RECORD an excerpt from a British publication entitled "The Electrical Review." I believe that what is recorded here is emblematic of the entire so-called Marshall plan and its inconsistencies. I read from this British publication:

It is somewhat surprising to learn that the Marshall plan for aid to Europe includes an item of \$141,000,000 worth of electrical equipment for Great Britain spread over the next 4 years. This represents an annual average value of nearly \$9,000,000; the total value of our imports of electrical machinery and apparatus during 1947 was of the order of \$3,000,000. So far we have been unable to obtain particulars of the kind of equipment

which the United States proposes to send us but it would have to be of a very special character to be acceptable. It would be absurd for us to continue to deprive home industries of much-needed electrical apparatus for the sake of export trade and then take similar equipment from America. It is true that we will not be expected to pay dollars for these goods—immediately at any rate—but the principle seems to be all wrong.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we are simply trying to find ways and means of dumping our excess production abroad in the hope that by so doing we will get foreign nations accustomed to our products, and, as I have said previously, find markets for the day when home consumption can no longer take up the slack.

At the close of my remarks yesterday I had just finished pointing out that the press of America has seemed to go out of its way to inflame the minds of the American people against the Russians, but at the time I concluded yesterday I had pointed out that I had noticed a number of articles recently in the press and in other places indicating that this trend was changing. I pointed out several articles I had recently seen seeking to present a fair picture of the Russians as people, not as ogres or devils with horns. I hope this is indicative of a reversal in this trend.

David Lawrence has written some excellent articles calculated to ease the tension between ourselves and the Russians.

God knows we need cool heads who will start throwing at least a little water on the flames of hate and prejudice and misunderstanding that threaten to engulf us and the world. But enough of this. I set out to castigate the press for their sins. I am happy that I was able to wind up with a good word or two for some of them.

THE FULTON, MO., SPEECH

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the Fulton, Mo., speech. I am sure everyone knows to what I refer without further elaboration.

To add to the bitterness engendered by the hate campaign in the press and over the radio, Mr. Churchill came to America and he went to Fulton, Mo., as the guest of the President of the United States, and there he made a speech that did more to undermine our relations with Russia than any one thing that had occurred up to that time. He suggested a military alliance against the Russians, for obviously there was no other nation against whom an alliance could be aimed.

Up to that time, Mr. President, there had been a certain freedom of access to our people in finding out what went on in Russia. I talked to many members of UNRRA missions, press representatives, and just plain citizens, who had been to Russia before that time, and they said there was no iron curtain. They said they went where they pleased and saw what they pleased.

I might interpolate that one of the gentlemen with whom I talked, who had been to Russia as head an UNRRA mission, was a Republican lawyer of New York, so he could not have been expected to be pro-Russian; but he stated that

he had been allowed to go where he pleased, and to see what he pleased, and that his freedom of action had not been interfered with.

Churchill likes to coin new phrases and make daring suggestions and hold the spotlight. Certainly, after the damage he did to the hopes of mankind on that one day at Fulton, Mo., he should have his belly full, he should be satisfied to rest on his laurels to his dying day.

But he is not satisfied. He still goes about, coining his phrases and cooking up his schemes. Among all the elder statesmen of all the nations his only rival in creating distrust and suspicion is Herbert Hoover.

MILITARY INFILTRATION

Mr. President, what would we have thought if, with the end of the war, the Russians had made Marshal Voroshilov, their war hero, their Foreign Secretary? Then suppose they had sent old Budenny, the general with the handlebar mustaches, over here as their Ambassador to Washington. And suppose they had sent generals hither and yon to represent them in the various capitals of the world. What would we have thought?

Would we have thought their intentions were peaceful? Or would we have been alarmed and distrustful? I am happy to say they did not do that. I wish I could say as much for us. No, the Russians did not do these things. One might almost wish they had because then our own actions would not appear in such an unfavorable light by comparison.

What were our actions in this regard? Our greatest war hero, our wartime Chief of Staff, became our Secretary of State on January 21, 1947.

Mr. President, I have a high regard for General Marshall, as a general, but is it reasonable to expect a man who has spent his adult life as a professional soldier suddenly to forget that background simply because he has been appointed to a civilian administrative position, indeed, the most important civilian post in America, aside from the Presidency?

The Secretary of State is ordinarily thought of as possessing the characteristics of a diplomat, a pourer of oil on troubled waters, a man who can engage in long and difficult negotiations without becoming impatient or exasperated—one who can compromise, cajole, give and take. Certainly, a military man is not schooled in any of these things. He is taught to run rough-shod over all opposition, to give orders and have them obeyed without question, and not to compromise with the enemy.

I think the military type of mind can best be summed up in the actions of General McAuliff at Bastogne when he was called upon to surrender and answered, "Nuts!" Very admirable behavior for a military man, but hardly the proper attitude for the conference table.

I think General Marshall is as well qualified, and no better qualified to be Secretary of State than would that master diplomat, Sumner Welles, be qualified to be Chief of Staff.

One day General Marshall was Chief of Staff, planning, and capably, I will

warrant, how we could keep such a military advantage over other nations as to guarantee our military security absolutely—no job of planning for peace through negotiations, kindly overtures, or disarmament proposals—but the next day he simply moved into a different chair where he was supposed to be a changed man completely. I just do not believe that can happen. I do not believe it did happen, with all due respect to General Marshall.

But, to continue with the story of our military: General Bedell Smith became our envoy to Moscow. Could that be construed by any stretch of the imagination as a friendly, peaceful gesture toward our wartime ally?

I wonder what the Russians thought. I wonder what the whole world thinks of all the military men we have sent into many foreign countries to fill diplomatic positions which have traditionally been the province of civilians.

I do not believe that it was a happy decision to embark upon such a course.

Certainly, the collapse of our vitally important relations with Panama, which it is largely agreed was the result of the bungling and incompetence of a general who, while he may have been a good general, was utterly lost in the field of diplomacy, should make us stop and consider.

As I say, the results of this policy have been to create suspicion and mistrust of our motives among the nations of the world and insofar as I can see, without compensating advantages. Certainly, it has not helped to win the confidence of the Russians. There are other things we have done which have not been conducive to good relations with the Russians.

IRAN—OIL AND GUNS

For example, we are in Iran exploiting their oil resources, that is, our private companies are.

As we all know, Iran is situated with relation to Russia quite similarly to the position that Mexico occupies geographically with relation to us. How would we feel if the Russians came into Mexico and started carting away the oil—oil that we need. Would we be happy about it?

And suppose we went down to Mexico and said, "Now look here, we do not mind Russia having some of this oil but we want some, too." And suppose we negotiated a lease for oil concessions in Mexico? We thought we were all fixed up, but then the lease came up for ratification by the Mexican Congress. And then if we can imagine such a thing, the Russians sent a message to Mexico and said, "You do not need to ratify that lease of Uncle Sam's unless you want to and we will back you to the hilt."

Well, Mr. President, that thing has happened in Iran.

The Russians did negotiate an oil concession with the Iranian Government. They may have used questionable tactics in doing so.

I do not know as to that. I doubt if they were any more questionable than the tactics we used in getting the Panama Canal right-of-way, for example.

And the Iranians could have appealed to the United Nations if they did not like

it. Nevertheless, when that treaty came up for ratification by the Iranian Parliament we sent the Iranians a note and said, "Do not sign that agreement with the Russians unless you want to, and we will back you to the hilt."

When I read that, Mr. President, the words "to the hilt" were in quotation marks, to give them added emphasis, and of course, everyone knows that when we say "to the hilt" we mean the atom bomb.

I am afraid that if the Russians had done a thing like that to us it would have meant war.

The only reason our actions have not brought war is because the Russians are too devastated, too unprepared to fight.

Now, we have a military mission in Iran, training the Iranian Army. Doubtless, we are sending in military equipment. The Army does pretty much as it pleases about such matters nowadays without bothering to ask Congress. Witness the recent disclosure that we have been secretly sending our airplanes to Chiang Kai-shek. There might never have been a word said about that but all of a sudden the Republicans went crazy and started yelling for aid to China, so our supercolossal military boys gave forth with the good news, the glad tidings, that they had been black-marketing aid to Chiang right along without bothering to ask that silly old man with whiskers otherwise known as Congress.

Suppose the Russians sent a military mission into Mexico—started training a Red Army and supplying them with military equipment. Do you think we would like it? I would not. I would be one of the first to insist that such unfriendly action should cease immediately.

Perhaps the reason the Russians have not been so bold as we might be is because they do not have an atom bomb; although I read in the newspapers the other day that some scientist said that one other nation did have the atom bomb. I do not know what nation that may be. He said, however, that the other nation did not have enough atom bombs to start an atomic war yet, and therefore there was no object in our reaching any agreement as to the control of atom bombs, because it would simply whittle down the advantage we had at the present time. In other words, this one gentleman thought evidently that when the Russians got enough atom bombs so they could talk turkey on equal terms, then we might come to some agreement limiting the use of atom bombs or abolishing their use.

Their country is devastated. They are not in the position to be as tough as we would be under the circumstances.

TURKEY

Now, let us take a look at Turkey.

The Turkish Government is utterly reactionary. Its people have no more political freedom and much less economic security than the people of Russia. Nevertheless, we are backing up that Government. We are in Turkey dredging the harbors and building roads.

What would we think if the Russians came into Mexico and started building roads and dredging harbors? I know what we would think and I know what we would do.

We would drop an atom bomb on them before they even got the dredge unloaded. We might not drop an atom bomb on them, but we would drop some kind of a bomb on them.

The proper procedure would have been for us to ask the United Nations to protect Turkey if we thought she was in danger and then let it be known we intended to back the United Nations to the hilt.

GREECE

Now, let us look at Greece.

Some of my colleagues may remember that I have been utterly opposed to the whole Greek-Turkish undertaking. God knows that events have amply justified my opposition.

A few of us contended that the Greek situation should be handled through the United Nations—that truly free elections should be held under the supervision of the UN.

It was our suggestion that we provide the money we intended to appropriate for Greece to the UN to help them in carrying out a policy of genuine self-determination and rehabilitation for the Greeks. That is my contention with respect to the pending bill. But we were overruled.

Our Government resumed its old role of pulling British chestnuts out of the fire. The British were in position to keep the Greeks under control no longer and so we took over in their stead—not exactly in their stead—they have kept a few military advisers down there and to the best of my knowledge they pretty much run things in their suave British way.

I am convinced that our action in Greece has caused those people more misery, hunger, and suffering than if we had kept out of there entirely. I never was in favor of leaving the Greeks to stew in their own juice. But, I repeat, they would be better off today if we had done that.

Some people will say, "Oh, the Russians would never permit the United Nations to solve the Greek situation." How do we know? We did not ask.

The fact is pointed to that the Russians have refused to participate in the UN border watch on Greece and have vetoed several resolutions to set up border patrols.

Mr. President, having the UN handle the Greek situation in its entirety and having us go in to support a Fascist regime and then asking the UN to hold the door shut while we kicked the people around are two different things. We would be in a much stronger position if we had asked the UN to handle the Greek situation in the first instance. I know for a certainty that the UN wanted desperately to handle that affair, and I believe they could have handled it.

If Russia had tried to stop it, we could then have gone ahead with a clear conscience. As it is, we are in the position of interfering unilaterally in the affairs of a country far from our borders.

Greece and Turkey are in key positions with relation to the Dardanelles—a strategic waterway and very vital to the Soviet Union.

Suppose there were a government friendly to the Russians on the South

American shore at the very narrowest point to the outlet of the Gulf of Mexico, and suppose that outlet were much narrower—comparable to the Dardanelles—I think we would like to have a friendly government in that country in a position comparable to Turkey. Would we like it if there were a government there friendly to the Russians and the Russians came over and bolstered up that government to keep it in power?

Suppose Cuba were on the other side of those imaginary straits out of the Gulf of Mexico and suppose Cuba were in a terrible political ferment and the decision as to whether there should be a government friendly to us or to the Russians were in grave doubt. Then suppose the Russians moved into Cuba and by force of arms supported a government friendly to them. I believe we would go to war, Mr. President. I believe it is very fortunate for the peace of the world that the Russians are not prepared to go to war. Some day, of course, they will be prepared.

They are getting ready just as fast as they can and using their ideological and infiltration tactics to better advantage than we have been able to use dollars, arms, and the threat of the atomic bomb. Now we come along with the so-called Marshall plan.

We must have known that the Russians could not participate—neither could they permit their satellites to participate. This plan calls for a degree of supervision and intervention in the affairs of other nations that the Russians or any other self-respecting nation could not tolerate and would not tolerate if they had any other recourse.

NEW LEADERS NEEDED

So you see, Mr. President, our foreign policy has accomplished no good objective in the past, and I do not believe that it will in the future until our whole approach is completely changed.

At this late date I believe the only solution is to take the formulation and guidance of our foreign policy out of the hands of those who hate Russia and place it in the care of statesmen who genuinely desire to get along with Russia and in whose sincerity of purpose the Russians could have confidence.

I believe that the most statesmanlike utterance that has been made on the floor of the Senate during this debate was the wish and the hope expressed by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that we might increase and expand our trade with Russia.

TRADE WITH RUSSIA

For a long time I have been convinced that trade with Russia would be one of the surest ways to minimize and iron out our political differences. If our moneyed interests which are so bitter against Russia and so fearful of communism should suddenly find themselves engaged in profitable commercial intercourse with Russia, I am convinced that their attitude would undergo an astonishing transformation. Today Russia is the best prospective market in the world for our manufactured goods. The Russians have gold and raw materials with which they could pay for the goods received.

There is very little prospect of any great volume of trade with other nations of the world once we quit—that is, if we ever do quit—giving nations all over the world billions of dollars with which to purchase our products. Our capitalistic economy is going to find itself in dire straits whenever we quit giving things away.

Ironically enough, I believe that Russia by her purchases from us—if we can forget our prejudices and trade with her—might be very instrumental in delaying for a considerable period of time that showdown for capitalism which they are supposed to be hopefully awaiting.

RUSSIA'S ACTIONS

I have had people argue with me that nothing the Russians have ever done has shown any desire to cooperate and live at peace with us, and that they are out to conquer the world. I deny that. I should like to point out that the Russians were in Manchuria and they could have stayed there if they had wanted to do so. It is a rich, populous, and vast territory. If the Russians were bent on world conquest I think they were fools to evacuate Manchuria.

To be sure, they took a great many industrial plants with them when they left, but it was their contention, and I think not without some merit, that these were Japanese-owned and therefore could rightfully be considered spoils of war.

But whether we agree with that contention or not, the fact remains that they did go home. If they were out to conquer the world, they would have been well on their way if they had chosen to remain in Manchuria.

The Russians were in Iran. Oil is very important to conquerors. There is oil in Iran.

To be sure, the Russians were a little slow in getting out. They were there, of course, as part of the war strategy; but when the matter was called to the attention of the United Nations, the Russians did go home. If they had had no regard for world opinion, or the United Nations and if they had been hell bent on conquest, I cannot feel that they would have left Iran.

RUSSIAN VETOS

Then, of course, there is the question of the Russian vetoes in the Security Council. The plain fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that we have an overwhelming control of the United Nations and the veto is the only weapon the Russians have. I am not trying to justify all their vetoes, by any means; but, at the same time, it is a fact we insisted on having the veto included as part of the United Nations machinery. Doubtless, we expected to use it if circumstances had been reversed. It is widely acknowledged that the UN Charter would never have been approved by the Senate had not the veto been included.

During the time the United Nations has been in existence, the Russians have used the veto 22 times. A great to-do has been made about this. I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare me a list of these vetoes and the reasons the Russians gave for using the veto. I think

it might be enlightening, if not to my colleagues, at least to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to run through this statement, which was prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service. It was very enlightening to me; it astounded me.

Veto No. 1 occurred February 16, 1946. It was a veto of a United States proposal that, in effect, would have dismissed Soviet charges against Great Britain for having troops in Syria and Lebanon. The Russians vetoed this dismissal of the charges against Great Britain, giving as their reason disapproval of the wording of the proposal. The fact remains that the charges were pressed and Great Britain was forced to get out of Syria and Lebanon.

Veto No. 2 occurred on June 18, 1946. It was a veto of a resolution to refer the question of the Franco regime to the General Assembly. The Soviets vetoed that resolution. They maintained that the Security Council should order a world-wide break in diplomatic relations with Spain, instead of leaving the matter for the Assembly. Personally, I agree with them. Anything that can be done to embarrass Mr. Franco, I am in favor of, and I believe millions of Americans would take the same attitude.

Then on June 26, 1946, they used the veto for the third time, vetoing a British-Australian resolution to keep the Spanish question on the agenda without prejudice to the rights of the General Assembly. This was very similar to the previous veto. It was the same question, approached from a different angle. This makes two vetoes on the same question, and marks the beginning of what I believe was a western drive to discredit Russia as seeking to undermine the UN by a reckless use of the veto. I believe the western powers were equally guilty of undermining the UN by indulging in such tactics.

On June 26, 1946, came veto No. 4. It was a veto of a contention that the British-Australian resolution on the Spanish question was procedural, and therefore not subject to vote. That makes three vetoes on this one question of Spain. In using the veto this time, the Russians justified their position by quoting from the San Francisco agreement, which stated that:

The decision regarding the preliminary question as to whether or not a matter is procedural must be taken by a vote of seven members of the Security Council, including the concurring votes of permanent members.

The experts whom I have consulted assure me that the Russian contention had merit at least equal to the arguments of the proponents of the resolution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my good friend the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not criticizing the Senator's position so far as the Russian stand in regard to Spain is concerned; but inasmuch as the pending bill is for the purpose of fighting communism, does not the Senator feel that there is a little inconsistency in the position now taken in connection with this subject?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly. I pointed out yesterday that the object of this bill is not to fight totalitarianism. They do not care about Peron's totalitarianism or Franco's totalitarianism. Russia's totalitarianism is all that worries them, and not because it is totalitarian, but because when countries become Communist, our big business interests can no longer go in and sell their goods and invest their capital.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Suppose I doubted the sincerity of purpose of those who would now fight communism. Is there any purpose in leaving Spain out of the picture?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think so. If they want to fight communism, they should fight it wherever it appears.

Mr. President, veto No. 5 was on June 26, 1946, of a reintroduction of the previous resolution.

So that makes five times the Russians vetoed proposals calculated to get Franco off the hot seat. Frankly, I would have done the same.

What I want to point out is that when we kept putting the same proposition up to them over and over, the conclusion reached at least by those antagonistic to Russia was that the Russians were using the veto recklessly.

Veto No. 6 was on August 29, 1946, of a recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations. The U. S. S. R. maintained that admission could not be recommended because it did not have diplomatic relations with Transjordan. Regardless of whether there is any validity to that argument, I should like to point out that a number of speeches were made on the floor of the Senate at the time criticizing Great Britain for seeking admission to the UN for Transjordan because its government was so completely subservient to Great Britain.

The next two vetoes are identical with the one to which I have just referred—veto No. 7, of a recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations; and veto No. 8, of a recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations. We evidently knew that the Russians would veto these two proposals, inasmuch as they were identical with the Transjordan question insofar as the nonexistence of diplomatic relations was concerned. Nevertheless, we put them forward and got those two extra vetoes—three on the same subject.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator at this point.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not do so for the purpose of interfering with the Senator's line of thought. But I should like to clear up our understanding of this policy of ours, if possible, even during the debate, to some extent.

Something has been made of the fact that we are fighting communism and totalitarianism throughout the world and we are sticking with our friends and we are fighting for democracy. Was there anything democratic in Portugal at the time when Portugal tried to get into the United Nations?

Mr. TAYLOR. No. Portugal is an out-and-out Fascist dictatorship.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. Suppose we go a little further. The pending bill would take care of Eire and also Sweden. Were they in the war any more than Spain was?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I call attention to these things merely to clear the atmosphere.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have much less objection to helping Eire and Sweden, with their democratic governments, than to helping Spain.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly so. The Senator is now talking of governments, not people, is he not?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have great sympathy for the Spanish people.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The philosophy of it is good. We are going to stick by France and those who fought with us. Is there any greater reason for helping Portugal or Sweden than there is for helping Spain?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; not a bit more, so far as I can see.

Veto No. 9 was on September 20, 1946, an American resolution calling for investigation of frontier incidents along the northern border of Greece. The Soviet Union held that no charges had been brought against Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and that to name an investigating committee would "cast a certain shadow on them" as well as on Albania.

Mr. President, why did we not ask the United Nations to take over the whole Greek question in the beginning? That is what I wanted at the time. All we want to make of the United Nations is a part-time "sweetie."

Veto No. 10 was on March 25, 1947, of a British resolution stating that the Corfu mine field could not have been laid without the knowledge of the Albanian authorities. The Soviet Union could not agree that the resolution represented the true situation in connection with the mine incident and again used the veto. I have not had time to plow through all the testimony, and I probably never shall. It is very voluminous. I have too many other things to do. It is a technical question on which I am not prepared to pass judgment or even to express an opinion. The veto was used, in any event.

Veto No. 11 was on July 29, 1947, of a United States resolution to maintain the Balkan Investigating Commission in power for two more years and to vest it with powers of conciliation as well as investigation. Russia vetoed this resolution, contending that the Security Council had no power to compel any country to admit an investigating commission and that the resolution could only create additional complications. Of course this all goes back to the fact that we had already taken unilateral action in Greece, had bypassed the United Nations, and only wanted certain actions taken when it suited our convenience.

The next three vetoes, Nos. 12, 13, and 14, are identical with 6, 7, and 8, the question of admitting Transjordan, Ireland, and Portugal to the United Nations. The Russians had once vetoed these proposals. We evidently knew they

would veto them again, but it added three more vetoes, six vetoes on one subject.

Veto No. 15 was on August 19, 1947, of a resolution introduced by Australia calling on Greece and Bulgaria, Albania and Yugoslavia to cease all acts of provocation and to enter into direct negotiations to settle the border proposal. If the United States had been included as one of the culprits in that resolution and the resolution had insisted that everybody get out and keep hands off and let the United Nations take over, then it would have been a good resolution in my opinion. As it was, Russia vetoed the resolution, which in effect was very similar to two previous resolutions calling for investigation of frontier incidents along the northern border of Greece. That makes three vetoes on one subject again.

No. 16 was on August 19, 1947, of a United States resolution fixing responsibility on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria for Greek border difficulties and calling on these nations to cease aiding Greek guerrillas.

Well, that strikes me as the height of hypocrisy on our part when we are interfering in Greece 10,000 times more than anybody else, at least, if you judge by the money spent in interfering. The Russians vetoed the resolution, which was similar to three previous resolutions dealing with the same subject. That makes four vetoes on a similar subject, again.

Veto No. 17 was on August 21, 1947, of a resolution to recommend the admission of Italy to the United Nations. Russia contended that Italy was not eligible for membership pending ratification of peace treaty, so they vetoed the resolution. I am assured by our experts that there was sound reasoning to support the Russian veto, although the issue was certainly debatable and there was merit on both sides.

Veto No. 18 was on August 21, 1947, of a resolution to recommend admission of Austria to the United Nations, and this compilation prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service says same as veto 17—that is the one we just mentioned on the admission of Italy. So another veto was built up against Russia identical with the previous one.

Veto No. 19 was on September 15, 1947, of a United States resolution requesting the General Assembly to consider the Greek border problem and to make recommendations on its solution. U. S. S. R. contended that adoption of this resolution would be a confession of the Security Council's inability to solve the problem and an evasion of its responsibility. This resolution is a close relation of four previous resolutions which the Russians vetoed and makes five vetoes on one subject again.

Mr. President, in order to be consistent with my original stand on the question of Greece, namely, that the United Nations should have been given the whole problem, I would have vetoed all these myself until the United Nations took full charge of the whole problem of Greece, including border policing duties, and removed all outside interference. This made a total of five vetoes on the Greek question.

Veto No. 20, on September 15, 1947, was on the question as to whether the United States resolution above was procedural or substantive. Russia had vetoed similar resolutions previously and it was probably a foregone conclusion that they would veto this one which simply questioned their right to veto the resolution on the Greek border problem. But you see, Mr. President, it added one more to the number of vetoes chalked up against the Soviet Union, making six vetoes on this Greek question. All of them, of course, were given inflammatory headlines in this country.

Veto No. 21 occurred October 1, 1947, on a resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contended that it would at any time admit Italy, together with Finland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria at one time, but would never vote for any of them separately.

I dare say, Mr. President, that Russia is as justified in seeking to have her friends admitted to the UN as is the United States or Great Britain.

On October 1, 1947, the same day as the twenty-first veto, came the twenty-second, on a resolution to recommend admission of Finland to the United Nations. The Russians did us a favor, it may appear. The notation opposite that entry in this summary prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service says, "Same as Veto 21." So by clever maneuvering, we managed to get the Russians on record with 22 vetoes.

As I say, Mr. President, when I was provided with this documentation I was astounded to find that this alarming number of vetoes concerned only four issues. And if we look at the question candidly, it would seem to me that our position in relation to these questions could well be carefully examined.

I hope the Congress never decides to put the President at a disadvantage by following this procedure. It might reduce his popularity in the same proportion that Russian prestige fell last year because of this veto question, but I am afraid the Congress would wind up in nearly as bad shape as the United Nations now finds itself. I think this whole business reeks of power politics and is a significant testimonial to the way the United Nations has been kicked around by the various nations in an effort to gain selfish advantage rather than peace for the world.

Mr. President, I should like to insert at this point in my remarks a brief documentary study of the Russian vetoes.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Use of the veto in the Security Council by the U. S. S. R.

Date	Veto No.	Issue	Soviet-stated reason for use
Feb. 16, 1946	1	United States proposal that, in effect, would have dismissed Soviet charges against Great Britain for having troops in Syria and Lebanon.	Disapproval of the wording of the proposal.
June 18, 1946	2	Resolution to refer the question of the Franco regime in Spain to the General Assembly.	U. S. S. R. maintained that the Security Council should order a world-wide break in diplomatic relations with Spain, instead of leaving the matter for the Assembly.
June 26, 1946	3	British-Australian resolution to keep Spanish question on the agenda "without prejudice to the rights of the General Assembly."	Same as in veto 2.
Do.....	4	A contention that the British-Australian resolution on the Spanish question was procedural and therefore not subject to the veto.	U. S. S. R. vetoes this contention on the basis of a San Francisco agreement which stated that: "The decision regarding the preliminary question as to whether or not * * * a matter is procedural must be taken by a vote of 7 members of the Security Council, including the concurring votes of permanent members."
Do.....	5	Reintroduction of previous resolution [veto].....	Same as veto 4.
Aug. 29, 1946	6	Recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations.....	U. S. S. R. maintained that admission could not be recommended because it did not have diplomatic relations with Transjordan.
Do.....	7	Recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations.....	Same as veto 6.
Do.....	8	Recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations.....	Do.
Sept. 20, 1946	9	American resolution calling for investigation of frontier incidents along the northern border of Greece.	Soviet Union held that no charges had been brought against Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and that to name an investigating committee would "cast a certain shadow on them," as well as on Albania.
Mar. 25, 1947	10	British resolution stating that the Corfu mine field could not have been laid without the knowledge of the Albanian authorities.	Soviet Union could not agree that the resolution represented the true situation in connection with the mine incident.
July 29, 1947	11	United States resolution to maintain Balkan Investigating Commission in power for 2 more years and to vest it with powers of conciliation as well as investigation.	U. S. S. R. held that the Security Council had no power to compel any country to admit an investigating commission and that the resolution could only create additional complications.
Aug. 18, 1947	12	Recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations.....	Same as veto 6.
Do.....	13	Recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations.....	Do.
Do.....	14	Recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations.....	Do.
Aug. 19, 1947	15	Resolution introduced by Australia calling on Greece and Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia "to cease all acts of provocation" and to enter into direct negotiations to settle the border problem.	U. S. S. R. contended that nothing had transpired to alter its views on the Greek situation.
Do.....	16	United States resolution fixing responsibility on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria for Greek border difficulties and calling on these nations to cease aiding Greek guerrillas.	U. S. S. R. pointed out that if action on the Australian proposal above [veto 15] was unacceptable, then this proposal "should be considered unacceptable even to a greater degree."
Aug. 21, 1947	17	Resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations.....	Russia contended that Italy was not eligible for membership, pending ratification of peace treaty.
Do.....	18	Resolution to recommend admission of Austria to the United Nations.....	Same as veto 17.
Sept. 15, 1947	19	United States resolution requesting the General Assembly to consider the Greek border problem and make recommendations on its solution.	U. S. S. R. contended that adoption of resolution would be a confession of the Security Council of its inability to solve the problem and an evasion of its responsibility.
Do.....	20	Whether the United States resolution above was procedural or substantive.....	See veto 4.
Oct. 1, 1947	21	Resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations.....	U. S. S. R. contended that it would at any time admit Italy together with Finland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria at one time, but would never vote for any of them separately.
Do.....	22	Resolution to recommend admission of Finland to the United Nations.....	Same as veto 21.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the point which I have tried to bring out is this: That while the Russian use of the veto certainly caused many people to doubt seriously whether the Russians wished the United Nations to function, at the same time it seems to me that the Western Powers went out of their way to bring about situations calculated to force the Russians to use the veto.

Mr. President, let us summarize this imposing number of vetoes briefly. It boils down to this:

There were five vetoes on issues relating directly to the situation along the Greek border.

The resolution on Corfu is closely associated, making really six vetoes on this one subject.

What it amounts to is this: We had bypassed the United Nations by taking unilateral action in Greece and we were trying by parliamentary maneuvers within the Security Council to force the Russians to endorse our actions in Greece, which I have always contended were indefensible because of the fact that we were bypassing the United Nations and because of the undemocratic and collaborationist nature of the Greek Government which we were supporting.

If we reverse the circumstances and put the shoe on the other foot, we find that the reason for the very first veto was our endeavor to have dismissed charges against Great Britain for having troops in Syria and Lebanon.

In that very first issue put before the Security Council we set a pattern by trying to protect our friends.

Then, Mr. President, there were five vetoes on Spain. Frankly, I wish that our country had been on the other side of this issue and had taken the initiative in seeking concrete action against Mr. Franco. I do not believe that our position in seeking an out for this Fascist dictator has enhanced our standing among the peoples of the world as a defender of democracy.

Finally, Mr. President, there are 10 vetoes around the admission of different countries to the United Nations. On each occasion we and Britain were seeking admission for nations friendly to us and the Russians insisted that the nations seeking admission and friendly to

them be included and that all should be voted upon at one time.

Every time there was a Russian veto, the press put it in banner headlines. The headlines did not say, however, that the vetoes were so often on the same matters.

TERRITORIAL EXPANSION

I come now to the question of territorial expansion. A great deal has been made of who has been expanding, and where. The question has been raised as to whether the Russians' behavior is proof that they want to engulf the world.

I do not believe it can properly be said that the Russians expanded when they regained territories which hostile powers had separated from them by armed invasion. However, it cannot be denied that the Russians have now included several other nations in their sphere of influence, not by direct military action, perhaps, but by techniques of ideological infiltration in much the same way that we use dollar diplomacy.

In accordance with an agreement with Great Britain to which I have previously referred, governments friendly toward Russia were established in Rumania and Bulgaria.

In direct contravention of that agreement, Yugoslavia, which was to be in the British sphere of influence, failed to behave according to Churchill's plan and it set up a government friendly to Russia.

Czechoslovakia now has a Communist government and is in the Russian sphere, but it was in the Russian sphere before the change of government.

At any rate the Russians are not alone in their expansion of their spheres of influence.

Despite our protestations that we do not want any territory, we have taken possession of a number of Pacific islands without anyone's permission but simply by informing the United Nations we were going to do it.

We are firmly established in Okinawa. Japan is certainly under our influence. We occupy half of Korea.

Turkey has come under our domination to a large extent. We are in Greece with armaments and increasing numbers of military personnel.

We are in China at least as much as are the Russians.

We are exploiting the oil of Iran and have a military mission and a sizable economic mission there.

We are still in Greenland despite the vigorous protests of Denmark.

We are establishing air bases in north Africa.

Arabia would certainly be classified as being under our sphere of influence.

We have aided and abetted the Dutch in their nefarious subversion of Indonesian freedom, and we have furnished the military supplies that enabled the French to reestablish themselves in Indo-China.

The western zone of Germany is under our domination, as the eastern zone is under Soviet domination.

The question of who has expanded the farthest from home, of which power is closer to the frontiers of the other, can be easily settled by taking a tape measure and a globe and measuring from the borders of the United States and likewise

from the borders of the U. S. S. R. to the farthest point of each country's occupation or domination.

Another good comparison is to measure from the farthest point of the other country's domination, for instance, from Yugoslavia at the present moment to the United States, and from our German zone or from our Korean zone to Russian territory, and then easily establish which country is closest to the homeland of the other.

I contend that we are at least equally guilty in the matter of expansion.

RUSSIANS NOT GANGSTERS

One more point, Mr. President, in this argument as to whether the Russians are the only menace to peace in the world. I have heard people say that we cannot deal with the Russians because their leaders are gangsters and tyrants. I cannot agree with that premise. I never heard of tyrants who worked long hours to improve the economic condition of their subjects.

This seems to be one of the most serious complaints that Mr. Kravchenko has to make against Russia in his book *I Choose Freedom*. Mr. Kravchenko, a former Russian official, complains at length over the fact that Russian Government executives must work long hours trying to make their economy work ever better and thereby raise the standard of living of the Russian people.

The Russians have improved the living standards of their people to an unprecedented degree in a very brief period of time. I have read in the press recently that their progress in the last year has been phenomenal. The Russians spend more money for education than any other nation in the world. I never heard of a gangster or a tyrant educating the people they intended to exploit. It is contended, of course, that they do not truly educate their people because they fill them full of Communist propaganda.

AMERICA IS BEST

I got quite a bit of pro-American propaganda along with my schooling. I think it is only natural and proper that a nation should bring up their young to believe that their country is the best in the world. As I said, I was taught to believe that, and the older I grow the more I become convinced that this is by far the best country on earth.

That is why I am arguing here today, Mr. President, that the Russians are not so bad as they have been painted, that it is possible to get along with Russia. In trying to point out that the Russians are not all bad I am aware that I am laying myself open to what I know will be a campaign of vilification which will certainly be hard to stand up under. If I did not love my country, if I were willing to see it destroyed, I would skip the whole thing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I stated yesterday, and I repeat, I want the American people to have freedom of expression, and so

far as I am concerned, the fact that the Senator might be running for a political office, the fact that he might have some views different from my own, does not make me feel that he is not just as good a Senator as sits in the United States Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I am only sorry to say that his belief that every man in this country has a right to say what he thinks, and even think what he thinks, is not shared by many people, and the freedoms which we have considered to be traditionally American are becoming severely circumscribed. I am afraid that if the trend is not stopped, we shall be in a very sad state, so far as our civil liberties are concerned.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. It is not necessary for the Senator from Idaho to have testimonials as to his patriotism and Americanism, but I wish to say that I do not want the moment to pass without attesting that I subscribe to every word and sentiment just expressed so well by the Senator from New Mexico. In my opinion there is not a better American in the United States Senate, or in America, than the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator from Florida sincerely, from the bottom of my heart. He knows the high regard I have for him without my saying it.

Mr. President, if we admit that Russia is as bad as so many among us seem to think she is, we might as well give up and prepare for atomic war, and we are told that would mean we might just as well go out and dig graves for ourselves and our families. I am not prepared to do that, regardless of the consequences to myself. While there is life, there is hope.

Mr. President, to admit that the Russians are as bad as they have been painted would leave but one alternative—a show-down fight, which the experts say would mean not only the end of Russia, but the end of us—the end of civilization, and probably the extermination of all life on this planet.

FOR LOVE OF COUNTRY

I am making this presentation and inviting the violent abuse that will probably be heaped upon me as being pro-Russian because I love my country and its people. I shall go beyond that, and say that I love all people everywhere. If I did not love my country, if I did not place the welfare of its people above my own welfare, quite frankly, I would be on the other side of this argument. I would join in the brave, breast-beating against Russia, because, Mr. President, the handwriting is clear on the wall. It will take something little short of a miracle to push us back from the brink of destruction where we stand at the present moment.

I know full well that if we become engaged in this conflict, if war comes to this continent as it surely will this time, there will be a great wave of hysteria and

a search for goats to sacrifice to appease the wrath of the people. I am convinced that, if that comes to pass, I will indeed be fortunate if I do not wind up behind the barbed wire of a concentration camp. Indeed, my life may well be forfeit for the stand I am taking here today.

If I were easily terrified, frankly, I would turn my back on what to some may seem a hopeless struggle to preserve sanity in this world, and make my peace with those who will be shouting "We were right!" should war break out. I cannot do that. For the sake of my wife and children, I almost wish I could. But it is not that simple, really. We cannot save ourselves by hiding in the mob and joining in the clamor because in another war the mob will be destroyed—all of us.

ONLY COURSE

Frankly, this is the only course I see open to me that presents the faintest avenue—the slightest gleam of hope—for the survival of those I love and those many others who trust and believe in me. I believe it is not too late to change the course of events and reestablish understanding between ourselves and the Russians. I believe it, if for no other reason than that to believe otherwise is to adopt the fatalistic Chinese attitude and prepare for the inevitable end.

We cannot make this change for the better with a President who has made plain his hatred of Russia. We cannot reverse the grim march of events with the present Congress when so many of its Members have tried to see who could outdo the other in stirring up the hatred of the people against Russia.

I believe these conditions will be changed. I have unbounded confidence in the good judgment of the American people.

I shall continue fighting for peace because unless peace is preserved there well may be no life; and without life certainly there is no hope.

While I cannot bring myself to the faith in nonviolence of Mahatma Gandhi, I would like to point out that, by faith and individual effort, with no finances, no armies, and no violence, Gandhi conquered the British Empire and won freedom for his people.

I am no pacifist; no advocate of peace at any price. I do not believe in appeasing any nation. As David Lawrence pointed out in his column a few days ago, a great and powerful nation such as ours cannot appease a weak nation such as Russia. We could be magnanimous and try to find some solution, but it remains for the weak to appease the strong.

I refuse to resign myself or my people to atomic destruction until every other recourse is exhausted. Until one real and honest effort has been made to reach an understanding with the Russians—when a sincere attempt at peaceful cooperation has been made and failed—there is time then for this grand final gesture of dying gloriously.

When I put myself in the place of the Russians, I can see why they have many reasons to mistrust and fear us and our intentions. But it is quite possible that only an expression from the American people demanding that an all-out, sincere effort be made to rescue the United

Nations and to convince the Russians that we have no designs against them, is the only thing that will save the world from destruction. I have confidence that the American people will deliver such a mandate at the first opportunity.

Mr. President, I have introduced a bill in the nature of a substitute for the measure now under consideration. It has been printed and is on the desks of Senators.

I should like to discuss both measures for comparative purposes.

I shall take up the bipartisan measure first.

There is not a great deal I have to say about this so-called Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. When I told my wife the other day that the name had been changed, and now it was E. C. A.—ECA—she asked, "What does that stand for? European Corporation of America?" I think that would be a good name for it, Mr. President.

It will create a host of new bureaucrats, some of whom will have almost kingly power over the lives of people in foreign countries.

They will have power to guarantee investments, presumably, of course, on a basis of the necessity of the project to the success of our plans.

In the past it has all too often turned out that friends and business associates profit from such arrangement.

Although I am not a lawyer, it seems to me that the strings attached to our help are more embarrassing and the compliance requirements more stringent than when our Federal Government grants aid to our States here at home.

I have been trying to find out just what this Marshall plan, ERP, BERP, or ECA is all about. I have been wading through the mountain of stuff the Government committees have gotten out and I have read some of the testimony, obviously not all of it, for it was presented to us the first of this week.

Most of the witnesses seem to talk all around the plan, but they never quite let us in on what it does.

They tell how much we need to help Europe—but never just how much this plan really does help Europe.

I think I have now figured out what the plan is all about and how it works, what it is going to mean for us and for the French or Italian farmer and worker and his family.

Western Europe is like a bottom-land farmer who has been hit by a flash flood. His fields have been flooded, his barn washed away, his machines rusted, most of his cattle drowned, the food in his cellar spoiled by the spring flood coming down the river. He is really in bad shape. And most of the other fellows living near him are in the same shape. So they go to the banker in the next town and ask for help, for a loan to buy flour and seed and the machines they need to get back on their feet again. The banker calls in one of the farmers, Ernie we might call him, and says:

"Ernie, I'll be glad to lend you money. You have a good reputation with all the merchants in town and you've always been a good risk. And besides you and most of the other boys are in the same church that we belong to."

"But you know, Ernie," says the banker, "this is a big thing. We get these floods every couple of years and we've got to do something about that river besides just helping you boys get over this year's trouble."

"You know, even while the flood was on the board of directors of the bank met and we decided we ought to get everybody in town to pitch in and help out. We're putting on a big show for your benefit. Everybody is donating something and promises to help out. In the meantime, why don't you get together with all the other fellows on your side of the river and draw up a careful estimate of what you all need to get back into production."

Ernie thinks that is a good idea. So he goes home and talks it over with his wife, and she thinks it is a good idea, too. So they start calling all the other farmers on their side of the river to get together and draw up an estimate of what they all need so they can submit it to the banker.

But Ernie's wife suddenly says: "Ernie, what about the farmers on the other side of the river? They're worse off than we are, and if we do anything on this side, they'll have to do something on the other side or it won't do any of us any good. Besides we do quite a little horse trading with them. And some of them are my kinsfolk."

Ernie, who has never liked the boys on the other side of the river, especially his wife's family, reluctantly agrees it might be a good idea to invite the fellows on the other side of the river. But he remembers the banker told him to invite just the boys on his side of the river. So he asks the banker about it.

The banker says, "Well, go ahead and invite them, but you might tell them we're going to have some drastic changes in the way they run their farms if they want to join up with us on this thing."

So Ernie invites them and tells them what they are going to have to do. When they hear of some of these intended changes, they walk out, which makes Ernie feel just fine, because he never liked them anyway.

So Ernie and all the boys on his side of the river get together. They sit around a while figuring how little they can get along on and must borrow from the banker. We will call the banker Harry. So a couple of weeks later in they all come to see Harry, the banker. Ernie brings his wife along, because she has always been the manager in their home.

The banker, Harry, takes a look at their estimate and goes into a huddle with his board of directors, which includes all the businessmen in town. Then he calls Ernie and Henri and Rocco and all the other boys in and tells them, "Fine, boys. We've cut your figures here and there a little, but they looked good to us. This looks like a real job. Now there are only a couple of things to do before you all sign up for your loans."

Then Harry begins to tell them about the conditions of the loan.

By this time the boys and their families are pretty desperate; things are get-

ting tougher. They are not in the mood to bargain or argue much.

Harry says, "First, boys, we're not going to be able to let you have all the seed you need, and we'll have to cut down on any tractors. Ernie can't have that hay baler, and Henri can't get that manure spreader, and Rocco can't have that plow, and it looks as though we won't be able to let any of you have any of the milking machines."

"You see," says Harry, "we're sending the tractors and the seed and the plows and the milking machines over to Heinz over there, the guy who lets his pigs through your fences to run all over your cornfield every couple of years to fatten them up free of charge. He's in a bad way, but it looks like he can get back on his feet faster than any of you other fellows."

"But don't worry," says Harry, "we've got some flour ready for you and we've got some cases of bran flakes for your families. And I'll tell you what—we'll let you have some new oil burners."

"We just got in a shipment straight from the East, from a factory I have an interest in, best little oil burners you ever saw. Once you put these in, none of you will have to go out and cut wood for your stoves, and we'll be able to send in oil trucks regularly so you can buy oil from us."

"Now, let's see," said the banker, "this isn't just a matter of tiding you boys over the next harvest. It's a big plan so you can get out of debt and get back on your feet in four years. It looks to me like you'll have to sell more milk and raise more wheat for sale. You won't be able to keep any of that wheat for seed. And you'd better cut down on your kitchen gardens for the next couple of years and stick to raising the things you can sell. You'll have to sell all your milk and butter in town. Besides you can buy canned food, anyway."

So Ernie says, "Well, I guess that's all right but we could help ourselves out a bit by trading with the boys across the river—they will grow good vegetables as soon as they can get some cultivators and clear the muck off their land."

But Harry has an answer to that. He says, "Sure, go ahead and trade with them, but you cannot help them clear the muck off and you cannot sell them anything we send you even if they can use it better than you—and we are going to make mighty certain they will not be able to buy any of these things from us here in town."

That is all right by Ernie, but his wife starts to do a little figuring. Without the milking machines and the tractor and the cultivator, that means the kids and she will have to work night and day; the kids will not be able to go back to school. And without the food from across the river, that means they are not going to get as much to eat.

"And then, what about repaying the loan?" Ernie asks the banker.

"Oh, that is all right," says Harry. "We know it will take a long time to pay this, so we have worked out a long-term arrangement. We will let you have most of the things you need free out of donations by the people who work here in town and the rest you can pay for by

building a special crib on your farm and putting aside a part of your crop or some of your butter every month for us."

"And what do we do with the stuff we put aside that way?" asks Ernie.

"Well," says Harry, "we have not quite figured that out. We do not want it in town here—it might make prices drop. But maybe some of the merchants who will be selling you things can come in and take it—or swap it for a partnership with you. We have not got that quite figured out. Anyway, you will not have to worry about it."

"Oh, and there is something else," says Harry.

"After all, this is a kind of new idea. We have got to see that it works right, so we are sending a man to live with you to see that everything is done right, and that you do not waste the stuff we are sending you."

"He will keep a record of everything we send you and he will see to it that you do not trade with the boys across the river, and that you put aside the right amount to keep up payments to us."

"We will just move him right in and he can live with your family."

"Looks like you will have to give up your bedroom for a while."

"Be sure to feed him well. He is our agent, and he will tell you just exactly what you have got to do every day."

Ernie begins to scratch his head at that idea.

But that is not all. The banker then goes on to say, "Of course, we will take a mortgage on your farm and your house and your cattle."

Ernie's wife pipes up just then and says, "And how long do you think we will take to start paying off the mortgage and getting out of debt?"

"Oh," says the banker, "by the end of 4 years, you'll be just a little worse off—we figure 10 percent worse off—than you were in 1938."

"Yes," thinks Ernie's wife, "that's the year two of the boys had to be kept out of school because we couldn't buy shoes and we couldn't afford a doctor for me when I was sick."

Ernie is a little puzzled by this generosity. But Harry has a couple of other little strings in his pocket.

"In the first place," says Harry, "we want to see you boys on this side of the river form yourselves into a little association for your own protection against the boys on the other side of the river."

"What for?" speaks up the missus.

"Well, you never can tell," says Harry. "They're a bad crew over there. It's true they're worse off than you are, but they're up to no good. And we've got to protect ourselves. So we're forming a little protective association."

"And," he adds, "we've already made Heinz treasurer of the association because he's got a bigger farm and he's getting a bigger loan from us."

By this time Ernie is in no position to argue. Of course, he remembers that Heinz came over one time and mistreated his daughter. He let his stock overrun the farm, and one thing and another; but Ernie is in no position to talk back. He needs that sack of flour and a hoe—since he cannot get a tractor and cultivator to replace his old one—and a

couple of cords of wood—or rather, the oil burner. Besides, he never liked the fellows across the river anyway. So he agrees.

But just as he is ready to sign on the dotted line, the banker leans over, pats him on the back and says, "Oh, by the way, there's one other thing. You know, I have some farm lands myself, the other side of town. My farms also turn out butter and wheat and cattle. I sell my stuff right here in town, so you boys will have to market your stuff somewhere else, not in this town."

Just then Ernie's missus, who has been sitting there all this time pretty quiet, pipes up and says, "By the way, Harry, what do we need that new protective association for when we have that big new United Neighbors Cooperative that we set up right after the last flood? Everybody on both sides of the river belongs to it, except for Heinz and a couple of others who won't act neighborlike. We were getting all set to build a dam and dikes on both sides of the river to hold the floodwaters. We can't build a dike just on our side of the river. Whatever's going to happen to that big co-op which we all joined to build that dike? You're a member, too, you know."

"Oh, you mean that big United Neighbors Co-op," says Harry. "That's just window dressing. That's no good for our kind of people."

By this time Ernie is so weary of all these conditions that he is in no shape to say anything more. So he signs the mortgage and the agreement—and despite the fact that they have to form a new protective association, each farmer has to sign a separate agreement with the bank.

Just as Ernie is going out the door of the bank with a slip to get a sack of flour, a hoe, and the oil burner the banker calls out to him:

"Oh, Ernie, by the way, there's just one other thing. I'm afraid you're going to have to divorce your wife. She's a Red. She wants to work with these people across the river in that big United Neighbors Co-op. She's not our kind."

Mr. President, that is the Marshall plan, ERP, BERP, or whatever we choose to call it. What we are telling the people of Europe is that they cannot have the machines they need to rebuild their industry, but they must export more anyway.

We tell them that they cannot have as much food as they will need, but we will send them plenty of tobacco.

We call this a recovery program, but admit that at the end of it they will be 10 percent worse off than in 1938. We tell them they can trade with eastern Europe, but we make it impossible for them to do so except by bootleg trade between the two areas.

Instead of lending money to Poland or returning Yugoslavia's gold so they can produce more coal and grain for western Europe, we shall be shipping the coal and grain to Europe. We are making Europe convert to oil burners so that our Standard Oil and Texaco concessions in the Middle East can make more money selling oil to Europe. We tie them up in such tight controls that they cannot breathe without calling on the American

administrator. They cannot export or import without getting his permission. We demand a separate plan and agreement for each country. We make them adhere to our ideas on currency, credits, and tariffs. We make them open up their industries to American monopolies.

Our administrator will have supreme control over growing blocks of their currency which he can use in any way he wishes, to buy out control of their industries, to cause inflation or deflation, or to help favorite sons.

What happens at the end of 4 years? The experts themselves admit that at the end of this 4-year program, Europe will be eating less than it did in 1938. As for recovery, by limiting the kinds of goods we are sending them, we are indefinitely postponing recovery.

At the same time, we are doing the reverse for Germany.

We are sending Germany more machines and capital goods and helping to rebuild Germany as the center of a western federation which we are forcing down the throats of the people she devastated.

American big business moves into western Europe and can take over control, lock, stock, and barrel. All we ask is that they join us in fighting the cold war.

Earlier I pointed out that the people wanted and still want this program to be administered through the United Nations.

I was very happy to find the United Nations mentioned on page 2, and again on page 34, where there are three brief paragraphs devoted to the United Nations.

I am glad the paragraphs are devoted to the United Nations, inasmuch as there are very few in high places who are devoted to the United Nations.

The bill provides that the President is authorized to request the cooperation of or the use of the services and facilities of the United Nations. The United Nations enters into the picture in a positive way not at all.

Oh, yes, we will send the United Nations copies of our report to Congress on the operations conducted under this act and will send them copies of agreements concluded by the United States and participating countries if such registration is required by the Charter of the United Nations. We are not going to give the United Nations anything we do not have to.

That is all for the United Nations.

The bill calls for the creation of an advisory committee to be paid on a day-to-day basis, which means, of course, that the membership will have to be people of independent means, free to come and go and not be encumbered with the embarrassing necessity of holding down a regular job. That will insure that they are from the upper crust.

The bill establishes another joint congressional committee. That will mean another chairman's job and another committee staff. We will beat the Reorganization Act yet. It is already in almost as bad shape as the United Nations. That is very desirable, of course.

What I should like to point out particularly about this bill is the use of fine language and phrases in the declaration

of policy, such as "the restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence" and "it is declared to be the policy of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions and genuine independence."

As I have said, Mr. President, these are fine, high-sounding phrases; but how well do they stand up when we look at the actual operation of the Truman doctrine abroad?

Frankly, Mr. President, as I have previously stated, I do not believe that anyone truly thinks that this program is going to be any different in operation than the so-called assistance we have been giving to foreign nations up to now.

So let us see how we sustain and strengthen the principles of individual liberty and free institutions when we move in.

In the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, March 8, there was an article, almost a full column in length, written by Homer Bigart from Athens. It begins like this:

Nicholas Kolyvas, former Minister of Justice, said today that the current wave of mass arrests, deportations, and executions was the result of the Greek Government's interpretation of the Truman doctrine. It believes, he said, that Washington desires ruthless suppression of the left as an implementation of President Truman's containment of communism theme.

Mr. President, for many months I have seen accounts in our press, with monotonous regularity, stating that 30, 40, or 50 Greeks had been shot that day—not killed in battle, Mr. President, but lined up and shot because they did not agree and see eye to eye with the government that is presently in power in Greece. That government, which we are supporting, Mr. President, is under the domination of people who collaborated with the Nazis—stooges of Adolf Hitler. The people who are being killed by hundreds, yes, by thousands, are the ones who fought against Hitler's occupation.

To return to Mr. Kolyvas, the former Greek Minister of Justice, he has this to say:

"I suppose I'll be labeled a Communist and a traitor for saying this, but I believe these convictions should have been reviewed."

Poor Kolyvas. He will be next.

I read further:

"Remember, some of these crimes were committed in a period of extreme political upheaval and at a time when both British and American broadcasts were urging the EAM to neutralize and repress all elements collaborating with the Germans."

In other words, the government we are supporting in Greece is now shooting the people who fought against them when they were governing for Adolf Hitler.

Mr. Bigart has this to say about the present government, or rather he is still quoting Mr. Kolyvas, and he says:

In the matter of individual freedom, the coalition government of Liberals and Populists—

Of course, the Populists are the Royalists—

this government created last September by Loy W. Henderson, State Department Di-

rector of Near Eastern and African Affairs, has proved far more repressive than even the predominantly rightist governments which preceded it, Mr. Kolyvas maintained. He said thousands of suspected leftists have been deported without trial, journalists arrested for criticizing the government, and civil servants purged for disloyalty without benefit of the right of appeal.

Of course, Mr. President, we shall not let the last item, the one about the dismissal of civil servants without the right of appeal, bother us too much. We are in the same boat here at home. I wonder if the perpetrators of our bipartisan foreign policy are using Greece as an experimental laboratory to see just how far you can go in kicking people around, with an eye to applying the lesson learned here at home later on.

Also, I should like to refer back to this person, Loy W. Henderson. It seems that he is the ringleader in the nefarious scheme to have us back down from our stand on Palestine. Also, I understand, Mr. President, that a Vice President does not have a great deal to do, so I hope I shall be allowed the pleasure, after January 20, 1949, of personally carrying to Mr. Henderson a note saying, "Loy, we disaffiliate."

Just below the article to which I have been referring is another, the heading of which is: "Van Fleet escapes blast plot."

It seems, Mr. President, that the top military man we have in Greece, Maj. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, narrowly missed being blown up.

One of these days somebody is going to get blown up—someone important. What shall we do then, Mr. President?

Below that article is another one with this heading: "Turkey wants United States aid to take economic form."

The article points out, strangely enough, that the Turks, who have always been known as more or less bloodthirsty fellows, feel that we are sending them too many guns, and they would like to have something to eat and wear, if we do not mind.

Let us read from the dispatch:

Ankara sources who cannot be quoted said that the military aid program was drawn up in haste. They said the general staff had no time to consider all the aspects of the program suggested by the first American mission.

At the time when aid to Turkey was first proposed, Mr. President, I heard stories to the effect that the Turks did not want any aid; that we practically had to threaten them in order to make them accept any aid at all. This dispatch would seem to bear these stories out, because it speaks of the program suggested by the first American mission. We just made them take it, Mr. President. We are making everyone take something. Perhaps they do not have enough money with which to buy it; but by heavens, someone must take it.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to quote from an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, March 6, 1948, to further bolster my contention that the bipartisan coalition is absolutely insincere in its protestations that we are seeking to spread democracy all over the world.

But first let us understand that the Herald Tribune is supporting the ERP—or the Marshall plan or ECA or whatever we call it. They have not yet come to the realization that what they are supporting is just some more of what they are condemning in this editorial. The editorial has this to say:

At the same time that the information division of the American aid mission—

That is the one in Greece—

was reassuring the world to the effect that the Greek press enjoys as real a freedom as that existing in the United States, two Athens editors were being jailed for expressing criticism of a type that could never have been questioned in this country, even in wartime. These editors, who are Socialists (but anti-Communists) had attacked the government for executing political prisoners who had been in jail since 1944. The crimes they were accused of had been committed against the German Nazi and Italian Fascist occupation forces. Since they had been in jail for more than 3 years they could obviously have had no part in the recent and current guerrilla activities.

Imagine that, Mr. President. Those poor devils had been in jail since 1944. They were thrown in jail by Hitler's and Mussolini's boys, for crimes they had committed against the occupation. In other words, they were patriots. But now the Greek Government which we are supporting over there takes those poor fellows out of jail—that is to say, the ones who are still alive—and shoots them.

I read further:

The reasons given for their execution at this time are hardly flattering to the United States. During the period when the British were advising the Greeks, it was felt that the death sentences would not be carried out because of the likelihood of unfavorable reaction by British public opinion and the British Labor Government. Now that the British have been replaced by the Americans, this consideration apparently no longer holds.

So they take the boys out and shoot them.

Do you not think, Mr. President, that we are just a little off base when we criticize what goes on in any other country while these things are happening in Greece? Do you not think we are just a little bit hypocritical when, in writing a bill which will enable us to carry our Greek-Turkish program to other countries, we put in words and phrases, such as these, which I quote from the bill we are considering?

To sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions.

I cannot and I will not vote to inflict on other people the sad fate that has overtaken the Greeks since we set out to teach them about democracy.

Mr. President, are the American people and the American mission in Greece condoning brutality and murder, or are they not? Where is there an American note to Greece like the one our State Department sent to Czechoslovakia last week? And where, incidentally, is the British Labor Government, and what is it doing about Greece? Which American spokesmen for the Truman doctrine and its successor, the Marshall plan, have spoken

out in the name of this Government against what is happening in Greece? We have an American economic mission in Greece. We have an American military mission there too, guiding and instructing the Greek Army, which is responsible for arrests and executions. We have an American Ambassador in Greece. We have just sent over another top American general. Do you think for a moment, Mr. President, that the arrests and executions could be possible unless the American Government representatives approved them?

In contrast to the bill before us, which I believe is a wasteful and war-breeding continuation of the Truman doctrine, I have presented a bill which is on the desks of the Senators. It embodies the Wallace-Taylor program for genuine foreign aid through the United Nations. It calls for a halt to the cold-war hysteria of the Truman doctrine and proposes immediate steps toward world disarmament.

While we are on the subject of the cold war, Mr. President, I should like to digress to call the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the United States News World Report, on March 5, 1948. The heading reads as follows:

Rejection of Russian feelers—Truman decision to fight on.

To leave the United States News article for a moment, it would seem that Mr. Truman is a great "fighter-on-er." I see that he has just announced that he intends to fight on, on another front here at home.

The United States News article has this to say:

Czech coup as aftermath of United States refusal to meet.

In other words, Russia wanted to talk things over. Hard-boiled Harry refused, and Czechoslovakia was the goat.

Let us follow the United States News a little further:

Premier Stalin proposed, was turned down on a Truman meeting.

You will note, Mr. President, that there is no equivocation about these statements. David Lawrence, the editor of the United States News, is not one to make such flat statements unless he can back them up.

To continue:

United States decision is to go on with cold war, to try to win back gains Russia makes in Europe.

I digress here, Mr. President, to say that that, in my opinion, is absolutely asinine. Unless we are prepared to use everything we have, right down to the atom bomb, we are not going to win back any gains that Russia has made or may make. The only sensible thing to do is to get together, end the cold war, and make a serious and sincere effort at co-operation. I do not believe that will be done so long as we have a Government so completely under the domination of big business and the military.

The News article has this to say about the matter:

Now moves are expected as Mr. Stalin, rebuffed, goes along with plans to shove United States out of Europe and nail down victory.

United States isn't doing so well in getting the world straightened out, isn't making expected gains.

I imagine there were those who expected gains from the Truman doctrine as applied in Greece and Turkey, and who expect gains from the extension of that doctrine under the name of ECA. I did not expect gains at the time of the Greek episode. I voted against it. I knew that no good could come from bypassing the United Nations. I do not expect gains from the new adventure we are considering except financial gains for the big business interests that will be running this program.

The article goes on to say unequivocally that the Russians asked for a conference looking toward the ending of the cold war. Mr. Truman said he would not go to Russia. Stalin offered to meet him in Stockholm. Truman said no, he would not go any place; that if Joe wanted to meet him, he would have to come to the White House. If we are not absolutely determined to carry the cold war to its hot conclusion, why did we not suggest a meeting in Cuba. The President spent the last 2 weeks down there fooling around.

However, if the President has a dread of meeting Mr. Stalin except on his own doorstep, I have a suggestion to make. Let us just saw off the balcony, put it on a warship, haul it out in the ocean some place and let them talk things over, sitting on Harry's balcony. If any good came of such a meeting, that would be the best suggestion I have heard of for getting our money's worth out of this piece of second-story work. In such a setting the event would make great headlines. In fact, its fame might be so great that the episode of Romeo and Juliet would be erased as the top balcony incident.

The News article points out that Finland and Italy may be the next to pay the price of Mr. Truman's well-known mulishness. It also says that Austria is very wobbly, and we all know that France can just as easily go one way as the other. The conclusions drawn by the United States News are these:

Shooting war, however, remains improbable. The United States does not start shooting and is not likely to start shooting because of knowledge that shooting would lead to Russian troops pouring out over all of Europe and much of Asia.

I agree that the Russian troops would fan right out if we were to start a shooting war. I am sorry I am not so complacent as the United States News appears to be when they say we are not going to start a shooting war. I will agree with the last part of the sentence quoted, Mr. President, but as to our not starting a shooting war, I am not so sure. After all, the same man is still in the White House, who, against the advice of most of America's scientists, ordered the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. There is not much telling what he might do.

He is in a very precarious position politically. Frankly, I would have to have a lot to boot to trade my political prospects for his right now. When the new party really gets up steam, there is no telling what might happen. There

are some people who would rather have an atomic bomb dropped on them than to see Henry Wallace elected President. So I think we do have to worry a great deal about whether or not we will start a shooting war.

The News article goes on to say:

Russia does not start shooting for several reasons. One is that she is unable to get at the United States directly unless in a sneak attack. Another is that she fears the effect of an atomic-bomb attack when she is unable to hit back in kind. A third reason is that Russian industry is weak and the Russian people tired.

I agree with those conclusions, Mr. President.

Then the News article winds up in this way:

At some stage short of a shooting war one side or the other may tire of the fight and offer to talk when the other side too is in the mood to talk. If not, then the irritations that are building in a cold war eventually are to end in shooting war. Mr. Truman showed that he is not yet ready to talk.

I shall put this postscript on it; I do not believe it makes much difference whether Mr. Truman is ready to talk or not.

If we can prevent him issuing the orders for another Hiroshima until after the next election, I believe there will be a man in the White House in whom the Russians would have confidence and who could settle this matter very satisfactorily and honorably to everyone concerned.

But, Mr. President, I got away from the subject in hand, which was a brief description of the foreign aid bill I have introduced. My bill simply recognizes that we had better turn back to the United Nations now if we do not want war. The bipartisan Truman doctrine and the ECA would bypass the United Nations permanently, divide the world, and lead to war. My bill is based squarely on the Charter of the United Nations, which is the last best hope for peace. It will maintain these through international cooperation. It will provide real economic aid without intervention and interference with the right of nations to self-determination.

I believe the bill before us is doomed to certain failure.

It will weaken and distort the European economy at tremendous cost to this country, and it will result in American big business grabbing control of European industry.

Right here I should like to say that I am not seeking, neither shall I try, to weaken the measure which is now being considered. As I have said, I expect it to pass. I shall cooperate with the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan to try to make the bill the best bill possible. I think it will fail, but it will fail without my trying to hamstring it. I do not want that responsibility placed upon me.

My bill, "the peace and reconstruction act of 1948," provides that the United States shall take the lead through a \$5,000,000,000 contribution in setting up within the United Nations a Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration for Europe with contributions from all nations.

It provides for an emergency program to help Europe with food, fuel, and materials until the machinery of the United Nations Reconstruction Administration is ready to operate.

It would set up an ever-normal world food granary within the United Nations to assure a constant and continuing market for everything American farmers and all other farmers can produce and provide food for hungry peoples everywhere.

It would bar the use of the United Nations Reconstruction Fund for any military expenditures.

Money would be made available to all European nations in need without political strings, after each country had obtained approval of its own plan from the United Nations Reconstruction Administration.

My bill would permit universal disarmament to prevent war.

Mr. President, I believe a foreign policy for peace must look forward eventually to cutting military expenditures to 10 percent of the current rate if we are to stop the wasteful spending of an ever-increasing part of our budget in a hopeless arms race and save ourselves from becoming a totalitarian military state.

My bill is a bill for peace and reconstruction. The Truman doctrine in ECA is a bill that prepares for war and puts Europe on a permanent dole.

If the American people could choose freely, they would choose for peace, not war; for genuine reconstruction, not permanent poverty. I am convinced they will choose our way in November.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Idaho has submitted a substitute bill, and of course he is entitled to a vote upon it. Under the rules a substitute cannot be voted upon until all amendments which are pending shall be disposed of. I think it would be logical to vote upon the substitute at this time. I therefore submit the following unanimous consent proposal:

I ask that the rule be suspended, that the substitute submitted by the able Senator from Idaho be immediately presented to the Senate, and that without amendment or further debate the Senate shall proceed by yeas-and-nays vote to vote upon it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico objects.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wished to propound a parliamentary inquiry, but I shall wait until the Senator has concluded.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I know the Senator from New Mexico shares my desire to proceed to a conclusion with reference to this situation. Certainly there could be no fairer time to vote on the substitute offered by the able Senator from Idaho than at the conclusion of his address. I am not even ask-

ing for an opportunity to discuss his substitute. I think it will greatly facilitate the proceedings, and it would be highly logical, if the vote should occur immediately following the Senator's address. I think he is in agreement with the suggestion, and I very earnestly request my friend from New Mexico to permit us to proceed in that fashion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have noticed that there were very few Senators present and listening to the Senator from Idaho when he delivered his interesting address, and I am sure that the Senators are so much interested in doing the right thing that they would prefer at least to read in the RECORD the remarks of the Senator from Idaho. Notwithstanding my great desire to cooperate with the Senator from Michigan and conclude the proceedings in connection with the subject with as little delay as possible, I think Senators should have an opportunity to read in the RECORD the remarks of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I submit another unanimous-consent request. I ask that when the Senate convenes at noon tomorrow, the substitute offered by the Senator from Idaho shall be submitted to the Senate, and that without amendment or further debate at that time the Senate shall proceed to vote by yeas-and-nays vote upon the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire whether or not there is an amendment to the original committee bill pending at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the present time there is no amendment to the original bill pending.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, I should like to know of any rule which prevents an immediate vote on the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair there is nothing that would prevent the substitute being voted on at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under my construction of the rules, Mr. President, if a substitute has been offered and is pending, and there is no amendment to the original bill pending, the Senate must vote on the substitute, and there is no reason on earth for avoiding a vote on the substitute which has been submitted and is now pending. There is no amendment to the original bill pending, and there is no parliamentary way to avoid a vote on the substitute, unless some Senator wishes to address himself to the question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, even if the substitute is pending, it could be the basis of continuing speeches this afternoon, which we know are contemplated in respect to the bill itself, and the program of speeches probably would continue without voting on the substitute. The very earnest desire of the Senator from Michigan was to bring this particular phase of the matter to a definite conclusion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I share the desire expressed by the Senator from Michigan, and if Senators who have speeches ready would restrain themselves for a moment, a vote on the substitute would be in order, and the Senate could pro-

ceed to vote on it without any delay whatever.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is quite correct about that. I am assuming, however, in view of the objection to the unanimous-consent request, that there would be objection to the procedure the Senator has indicated, and of course Senators have ample resources at their command to prevent the result.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wanted to make clear that there was no parliamentary obstacle to an immediate vote on the substitute.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think my second request meets the desire of the able Senator from New Mexico, and on that basis I am hoping it may be agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I will go further than that. My reason for objecting was only in order that Senators might have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the substitute, but if the parliamentary situation is such that the Senate can vote now, I am willing that the vote may be taken at this time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand the Senator withdraws his objection to my original request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Peace and Reconstruction Act of 1948.'

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. The Congress finds that after the horror and devastation of World War II the victorious coalition, responding to the highest and noblest hopes of mankind everywhere, established the United Nations for the promotion and maintenance of peace. It is the declared purpose of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security; to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace; to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples; to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character; to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples; and to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these ends. Realization of these principles through the United Nations remains the world's last best hope for peace. The United States as initiator of the United Nations and a signatory to its Charter has the high responsibility of strengthening its organization and, through it, building the foundations of an enduring peace.

"Yet the foreign policy of the United States as embodied in the Truman doctrine and as practiced continuously since the announcement of that doctrine has seriously weakened the United Nations as an instrument for world peace and collaboration, and negated the high purposes of its Charter. Instead of taking collective measures, through the United Nations, for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, unilateral action under the Truman doctrine has divided the world into hostile blocs. Instead

of employing international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, the Truman doctrine has employed the economic might of the United States unilaterally for political ends. Instead of respecting the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples, the Truman doctrine has intervened in the internal affairs of other nations. Instead of making use of the United Nations as a center for harmonizing the actions of nations, the Truman doctrine has bypassed the United Nations and provoked international suspicion and tension which, if unchecked, can lead only to war.

"It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress that the United States take immediate steps to repudiate the Truman doctrine and reassert leadership in the great task of establishing and maintaining peace through the United Nations. It is the further policy of the Congress to respond to the desperate need of the European victims of Axis aggression for the reconstruction and economic development of their war-devastated lands by providing aid through the instrumentality of the United Nations and in accordance with the purpose of its Charter to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, while guaranteeing their right to determine for themselves the forms of their social, political, and economic institutions, without intervention or interference.

"UNITED NATIONS EUROPEAN RECONSTRUCTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 3. (a) The Congress calls upon the President to request the Secretary General of the United Nations to convene a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations at the earliest possible date.

"(b) The Congress calls upon the President to instruct the representatives of the United States in the General Assembly, upon the convening of that body, to submit a proposal for the establishment of a European Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration (herein referred to as the 'Administration') within the United Nations, based upon the following principles:

"(1) The Administration shall include representatives of the United States and of all European members of the United Nations.

"(2) The Administration shall be charged with the administration and distribution of a European Reconstruction and Economic Development Fund (herein referred to as the 'fund').

"(3) The fund shall be made up by voluntary contributions from members of the United Nations, or by quotas determined by the Administration on the basis of ability to pay and shall be in the aggregate amount of at least \$25,000,000,000 over a period of 5 years.

"(4) The fund shall be available to provide loans or grants to individual European nations for the purposes of rehabilitation, reconstruction, and economic development, to the end that the immediate human suffering of their people may be alleviated and their industry and agriculture restored and placed on a self-sustaining basis at the earliest practicable time. In addition, loans and grants may be made available for industrial development, with special emphasis on the industrially backward nations, to raise the living standards of their people, provide for the full utilization of their natural resources and promote economic cooperation and world trade.

"(5) Priority in the allocation of funds shall be given to those nations which suffered most severely from Axis aggression. All allocations of funds shall be based solely on this consideration and on the basis of need, without regard to the character of the political and social institutions of the recipient nation and without the imposition of any

political conditions or any economic conditions other than those necessary to insure that the allocated funds will be expended for the purpose for which the allocation was made, without waste or inefficiency.

"(6) The entire fund shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, and no allocation shall be made to finance the purchase, manufacture, or maintenance of any military establishment, armaments, munitions, military supplies, or equipment of any kind or character whatsoever.

"(7) Special attention shall be given to raising the levels of food production, providing an ever-normal world food granary and raising the minimum nutrition and shelter standards of all recipient nations.

"SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000,000 for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and a like sum for each of the four fiscal years next following, which shall be available for payment by the United States to the European Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration from and after the date it is established.

"EMERGENCY AID

"SEC. 5. In order to provide immediate emergency relief to the peoples of the war devastated European nations pending the establishment of the United Nations European Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration, the President, acting through such departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government as he shall direct, may make grants to the governments of European nations to finance the procurement, from any source determined by the recipient of food or fuel or any commodity, machinery, or equipment required for the production of food or fuel. In determining the nations to which grants shall be made under this section, and the amounts of such grants, the President shall be bound by the provisions of subdivision (5) of section 3 of this act and no economic, political, or other conditions shall be attached to such grants except for the united purpose expressly provided in subdivision (5) of section 3 of this act.

"SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000,000 to carry out the provisions of section 5 of this act: *Provided*, That no funds shall be obligated under such appropriation subsequent to January 1, 1949, or the date of the organization of the United Nations Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration, whichever is earlier.

"REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS

"SEC. 7. From and after the effective date of this act, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States shall not in time of peace, unless the Security Council of the United Nations shall otherwise determine, give or sell to any other nation any military or naval equipment, munitions, arms, armament, or supplies, or finance the purchase of the same by any other nation, and any moneys heretofore appropriated by the Congress for any such purpose shall not be obligated therefor.

"SEC. 8. It shall be the declared policy of the United States to promote universal disarmament as a means of preventing war and removing the crushing burden of mounting armament appropriations from the people of all lands, including our own. To that end, the Congress calls upon the representatives of the United States in the United Nations to propose to the Commission for Conventional Armaments the immediate reduction by all nations in their armament and military expenditures for all types of armaments to an amount not in excess of 10 per centum of the current rate."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry. I am prepared to vote, but it occurred to me that it might be well to have a quorum called.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan understands that the order is entered for an immediate ye-and-nay vote, and therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the Senate will immediately vote thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Overton
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Smith
Capper	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Dworschak	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Ecton	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	Martin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Murray	Williams
Green	O'Connor	Wilson

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of the death of the Governor of Connecticut.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is detained on official committee business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is unavoidably detained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement the question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] in the nature of a substitute. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent because of the death of the Governor of Connecticut. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent attending the funeral services of the late Governor of Connecticut, Hon. James L. McConaughy.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 3, nays 74, as follows:

YEAS—3		
Langer	Pepper	Taylor
NAYS—74		
Aiken	Green	O'Connor
Ball	Gurney	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Overton
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capper	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Kilgore	Stennis
Connally	Knowland	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Dworschak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tobey
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Murray	

NOT VOTING—19

Baldwin	McFarland	Umstead
Bushfield	McMahon	Wagner
Cain	Magnuson	White
Donnell	Malone	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Myers	
McCarthy	Tydings	

So Mr. TAYLOR's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It deals with the authorization in the bill providing for the possible charter foreign of 300 dry cargo ships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine on behalf of himself and other Senators will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 24, beginning with the word "merchant", it is proposed to strike out all through "subsection," on page 16, line 1.

On page 16, beginning with line 10, it is proposed to strike out all through line 20.

On page 16, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to explain very briefly what the amendment involves.

There is a provision in the bill that 300 American ships may be chartered foreign. We have already adopted an amendment that 50 percent of the American products going into this project shall be carried in American bottoms. This amendment will complement the other very well because, according to present figures, foreign-flag ships now have approximately sufficient capacity to carry 50 percent of the freight, and Americans now have a similar capacity in operation under the Maritime Commission. Consequently the adoption of this amendment will simply confirm the status quo and enable the intent of the 50-percent amendment properly to be carried out.

There is very great concern in the shipping industry over the future of our merchant marine. There is a very extensive shipbuilding program going on in foreign countries. Fifteen million tons are either under construction, contracted for, or contemplated. For that purpose 6,000,000 tons of steel will be required, and it is contemplated that 2,000,000 tons of such steel may come from this country.

The State Department has recommended deferring the portion of the ship-construction program which has not yet been contracted for. The Administrator may very well desire to exercise further restriction as to the amount of steel which may be used for a priority of this character. Inasmuch as there are sufficient ships for the present to solve the problem, I hope that the construction in European shipyards will not be carried on to the limit of their present capacity, which is twice the normal construction.

However, that situation is not affected by this amendment, except as it may be an indication of our desire.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Maine is offering an amendment to remove from the bill a provision authorizing the temporary transfer of 300 of our Liberty ships.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Representative BLAND, of Virginia, has served on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for more than a quarter of a century. During 14 years of that time he was chairman of the committee. In my judgment there is no Member of the Congress who is more familiar with our merchant marine than is Representative BLAND. I have discussed this question with him, and he tells me that in his opinion it would be very injurious to our merchant marine if we transferred any more of these ships to foreign countries.

Mr. BREWSTER. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that 2 days ago I placed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. BLAND indicating his very serious opposition to such a program. At that time I characterized him as one of the oldest and best friends of the American merchant marine.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I also wish to say that my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who has left the Chamber to attend the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McCabe, asked me to say for him, if I had an opportunity to do so, that he is in sympathy with this amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the section of the bill which the able Senator from Maine proposes to delete is the only section in the bill, I believe, with respect to which the Committee on Foreign Relations divided in its consideration of the bill. There was very sharp division in the committee on the subject.

As the bill was originally submitted, it provided for not only the charter but the sale of ships to foreign countries. The committee struck out the provision for the sale of ships, and left in the bill the provision for the charter of ships.

As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee I am not in a position to approve the amendment of the Senator from Maine on behalf of the committee. But in my own personal capacity I should like to say that it seems to me that since Congress itself within the past 60 days has passed a bill, which has become the law of the land, prohibiting the charter or sale of any of our ships to foreign countries, this provision in this bill would be, to put it mildly, inappropriate.

So far as the Senator from Michigan in his personal capacity is concerned, he will vote for the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the other day, when this amendment was offered, to be printed and lie on the table, I made a brief statement with reference to the reason why the committee inserted the provision in the bill. As the Senator from Michigan has stated, when the bill came to the committee originally it carried a provision for the sale of 200 ships

and the chartering of 300 ships, on the theory that the 2,000 ships which are now tied up in the harbors and ports and streams of this country might well be utilized to carry some of the freight which is to be procured under this proposed act; and that inasmuch as it would require a considerable outlay of money to condition those ships so as to make them seaworthy, it might be well to charter some of them and sell some of them, in an aggregate number of 500, to foreign countries, in order to enable them to carry that proportion of the commodities to be procured in other countries than the United States, or even in this country to some extent.

Attention was called at the time to the fact that the Senate had just passed a bill prohibiting either the sale or the charter of these ships to any person not of American citizenship. There was a division in the committee with reference to that matter. In the committee I voted for the provision, because I felt that on the showing made in regard to these particular ships there would be a saving to the Treasury of the United States if some of the 2,000 ships—one-quarter of them, to be exact—were made available to the countries which are to be the beneficiaries of this program, to enable them to carry in such temporarily chartered ships a part of the commodities to be procured.

But since the amendment was adopted in the committee, additional information has become available, and it indicates that probably it would cost approximately \$25,000 to recondition each of these ships. Three hundred times \$25,000 is a considerable amount of money, and probably it would have to come out of the Treasury of the United States. So the amount of net savings on account of the use of these ships, through their charter to other countries, thus would be considerably reduced.

When the committee struck out the provision for the sale of 200 ships, it was stated by the State Department, through its spokesman, that it would cost approximately \$50,000,000 out of the Treasury to haul these products, without the charter or sale of any of these ships; and we were really asked to add \$50,000,000 to the \$5,300,000,000 in order to take care of that item. However, that was not done.

In view of all these circumstances, I am not prepared today to oppose the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Maine, eliminating the provision for the chartering of 300 ships. We might argue legitimately as to the amount of money that would be saved or as to how much it would cost the Treasury, depending on whether we charter them or do not charter them; and I suppose we might contend that the last word of Congress which is inconsistent with some previous act would take precedence over that act and would become effective.

But inasmuch as a few days ago the Congress did enact a law prohibiting the charter or sale of any of these ships, I do not wish to be insistent or to have the Senate be insistent in retaining this paragraph in the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In that connection I have also had the information about which I spoke to the Senator the other day, namely, that so long as these ships operate under the American flag, there will be, I believe, an estimated \$27,000,000 paid to the United States Government for their charter or hire, under the provision that 15 percent of the value of the ships shall be paid each year. Of course, there will possibly be increased costs of operation in sailing them under the American flag, but we recognize that in connection with all our maritime legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I appreciate that. I am told that there possibly would be an income of \$27,000,000, but that would be offset by the cost of operating the ships, the sale of which was contemplated as the proposal came to the committee originally.

These ships were built as a result of the war, Mr. President. I express the earnest hope that we shall not allow these ships, which were built with the money of the taxpayers of the United States, to rot in the harbors and rivers and estuaries of the United States, without trying to put them to some use. Although they were wartime ships, they cost the American people considerable sums of money.

So I hope that what we do today will not in any way interfere with the use of those ships for the benefit of the American merchant marine, but will stimulate their use either by our own country or through private ownership, if anyone is willing to buy them and operate them, so that we shall not be compelled to see approximately 2,000 Liberty ships rot in our harbors during the next 2 years.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I hope the Senator from Kentucky will also find himself in agreement with the policy indicated by the State Department, namely, that the European ship-construction program should be somewhat slowed down, since it is not an essential priority. The ships are available. Although we wish to keep up their normal shipbuilding and shipping activity, nevertheless if it were to be carried too far, that obviously would be an unwarranted strain on our steel supply, as well as on the manpower of the foreign countries.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that situation. It is a complicated matter. The question of how much steel to be applied to these purposes we should allocate to foreign countries, and so forth, definitely enters into the situation.

At any rate, I hope we shall utilize the existing ships to the best possible purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator whether he knows how much steel is to be allocated in the 4-year period of the Marshall plan, and particularly in the first year, for the construction of ships under the shipbuilding programs of the recipient countries.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is contemplated that 2,000,000 tons of steel shall be exported. We cannot say definitely whether all of it will go into the building of ships or into other channels, although obviously not all of it would be used for the building of ships.

Mr. BARKLEY. Obviously all of it will not go into the building of ships.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course not. But I wonder whether a break-down has been made, to show how much of the steel is allocated to the shipbuilding program of the 16 countries.

Mr. BREWSTER. They contemplate building ships which will require 6,000,000 tons of steel in the next 4 years. That is the requirement for the shipbuilding program for Europe. That is the total drain, regardless of whether it is on our steel supply or on the European steel supply.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Of course, undoubtedly a considerable portion of the steel which will be required by the European countries will come from the United States. Of course, much of the steel they require will come from the Ruhr. But I do not think there is any break-down to show how much of the steel will be allocated to shipbuilding.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If 300 of these ships should be chartered, would that permit a reduction in allotment of steel for the shipbuilding program this year under the Marshall plan?

Mr. BREWSTER. It would have no direct effect upon it at all.

Mr. WHERRY. None whatever?

Mr. BREWSTER. It would be wholly in the hands of the Administrator of the program to determine whether he would exercise his authority to retard the European ship construction, according to whether he considered it essential.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I did not mean that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is possible that if the 300 ships were used in order to carry the products to Europe it would reduce the amount of steel that would be necessary in order to construct new ships.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Administrator would have the right, and it would be his duty, to take that into consideration in determining the allotment of the steel to recipient nations.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I raised. I think it is a very salient point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whether the 300 ships were used by the recipient countries or by the United States, or by some private enterprise, that would have no direct effect.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. I was merely wondering whether, in the final analysis, if the ships were chartered and put into operation, it would not relieve the commitment of steel to the amount involved and make it that much easier on a commodity which is very scarce in this country at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whether chartered or not, their use would undoubtedly reduce the requirement for steel in shipbuilding.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I merely want to say a word or two on this matter. The form in which it was first presented to the committee has already been stated in the debate. There are two aspects of it; on the one hand, the additional expense of Government operation, and on the other, the desirability of aiding our merchant marine and our merchant seamen.

Mr. President, it seems to me there is one other point worthy of note. In the great program we are initiating, it seems to me to be just as well that we here control as much as we can the shipping itself, the vessels, and the sending of the vessels to the different ports. Mr. President, because of the consideration of giving employment to our American merchant marine, together with all the other considerations, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as one member of the committee who voted against putting this language in the bill, I think perhaps I should say a word for the Record. There was one argument in favor of the language which was persuasive, and that was that it would tend to reduce the cost of operations under the bill. But I felt that there were many qualifying factors which diminished the saving that would occur. I also felt that broad considerations of national policy would make it advisable for us to maintain a merchant marine and made it on the whole desirable that the language should not be retained in the bill. Therefore, I am happy to give my support to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to subscribe to that sentiment. I believe we made a great mistake after the last war in letting our merchant marine deteriorate. It cost us many hundreds of millions of dollars to restore it. At one time during the war, we had the basis of the greatest merchant marine that any nation has ever had. In many respects I think the great marine power we once possessed has been dissipated. I think the time will come, if we further dissipate it, when we shall have to restore it at a vastly increased expenditure to the country. Therefore, in the national interest, in furtherance of our national economy, and out of a due regard to the merchant seamen who would be thrown out of employment if the proviso were retained in the bill, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Maine will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Senate bill 2202, commonly known as the Marshall plan. The so-called Marshall plan is the most mysterious crossword puzzle of the century. It has been presented to the people of this Nation as being so many different things that they are completely confused and bewildered. The Nation has been

divided into groups and each group has been propagandized separately to show that they may be benefited, but very little has been said about the destruction that will be wrought to our Nation as a whole.

Religious groups throughout the country have been propagandized and told that the Marshall plan is a great humanitarian act of charity. Industrialists have been told that it will provide a highly profitable foreign market for the goods they manufacture. Farmers are told that it will keep agricultural commodity prices high. Laboring people are told that it will provide them with plenty of jobs at high wages. The people of certain foreign countries are told that it will rebuild their factories, increase their standard of living, and restore their economy. The rank and file of patriotic American citizens who believe in the American constitutional form of government and who do not want to see our Government converted to socialism or communism are told that the Marshall plan will stop communism dead in its tracks in Europe before it spreads across the Atlantic Ocean and takes control here. Mothers and fathers are being told again and again and again that it will keep their boys and girls from being called to fight and perhaps die on foreign soil. American voters are being told, "See how we dehorned the thing or pulled its teeth—vote for us." American taxpayers are being told to "wait patiently until we get through giving everything away and then we will reduce your taxes." Consequently, Mr. President, it is difficult to know what the Marshall mystery plan really is.

The so-called Marshall plan not only originated mysteriously but since its start it has been amended or modified to meet the whims of any person or group whose support the administration thought was needed to assure the passage of the measure by Congress. Secretary Marshall said, "All or nothing." So he was slapped down in effigy by amending the proposal to authorize it in four smaller yearly doses instead of just one big 4-year dose. This great improvement was evidently based on the same philosophy that applies to cutting off the dog's tail inch at a whack so it will not hurt so much. It really does not hurt the man with the ax who cuts off the dog's tail, but the poor dog, like the American taxpayer, can only howl in a language his tormenters cannot or will not understand.

A great howl went up about permitting the plan to be administered by the Secretary of State. So the plan was amended to let somebody else administer it. But the joke is that both the Secretary of State and the new Administrator are appointees of the same President, who, of course, is the actual administrator, and each must perform as instructed by his boss, the President. So the only difference created by that change is to set up a new bureau under a newly created assistant to the President, and to create more Federal jobs.

On top of all this confusion, deception, and meaningless changes the bill finally comes to the floor of the Senate in printed form, the reading of which convinces me

that it will permit the executive branch of our Government to do anything under the shining sun, from playing tiddly winks to waging war with anyone or any nation from Helsinki to Shanghai. I am firmly convinced that the master minds in their hideouts who advise our executive branch care not one whit what is printed in the bill, just as long as the authorization for the \$5,000,000,000 is there. That is the essence of the Marshall plan—billions, billions, and more billions to scatter to the four winds.

So, Mr. President, with this picture of the Marshall plan in mind I shall now analyze it and express my views on the subject. In expressing my views on the plan, let it be distinctly understood that I am expressing them exclusively on the plan, and making no statements or insinuations about persons. I give full credit to the honesty, sincerity, and patriotism of every Member of the Senate. Here each of us has the unquestioned right to his own opinion and his own way of expressing his opinion. I am merely expressing my own opinion of the plan.

In the first place, it certainly cannot be denied that the Marshall plan, from an over-all viewpoint, follows the same general line as many previous bills which have been under consideration by the Senate, and which were approved by the Senate. I refer to lend-lease, to UNRRA, the British gift-loan, Greek-Turkey aid, aid to China, and the interim France-Italy contribution. I opposed each and every one of those plans for several good and valid reasons. One good reason is that such tactics constitute meddling in the internal affairs of foreign nations and step by step lead to one war after another. Another reason is that such tactics result only in pouring billions of dollars down rat-holes, while conditions in recipient nations have constantly grown worse. Another reason is that it guts our Treasury, impoverishes our taxpayers, and weakens our economic structure at a time when another war is staring us in the face and we need a strong economy. Another reason is that all of these expedients have taken money from American taxpayers, either by taxation or by the borrowing process, and given their money to foreigners. I consider such action to be a flagrant violation of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Inasmuch as I have taken a solemn oath to uphold and defend the Constitution it is my purpose to respect that oath. It is my judgment, Mr. President, that, regardless of the language used, whether the Marshall plan calls for direct donations or loans, the net result will be that the sum total cost of both the direct grants and the loans must ultimately be paid by the American taxpayer.

As I read the Constitution of the United States, I find nothing in that document which authorizes the Congress to appropriate the money of the American taxpayer out of the Treasury and give it to some foreign government. That reason alone, I think, is sufficient cause for opposing the Marshall plan even if I had no other reason. I believe that the Constitution was adopted with the understanding and with the full intention that it

should be observed by the Congress of the United States.

Suppose we consider the Marshall plan as a great humanitarian act of charity, as is claimed by some of its proponents. This naturally has a strong appeal to me because I believe sincerely in charity. Charity is taught and recommended by the Holy Scriptures, but as I interpret the the commandments of God and the teachings of Christ, they were directed to individual human beings and not to corporations or governmental organizations. In the first place, men and women have souls while organizations are soulless.

In some cases charity might be practiced as an eternal protection to the human soul. When the body is laid to rest and the soul goes on to meet its Maker an accounting of charitable activities of the individual must be made. No part of any organization is expected to go on to an eternal haven of rest or even eternal torture.

Furthermore, Mr. President, under our form of Government there is supposed to be a complete separation of church and State. Saints and sinners alike hold equal positions as citizens under our democratic form of government, and if the principle of equality and justice is a part of our governmental philosophy is it fair and just to take by force personal property from those who do not believe in charity and use it for that purpose? I think not.

Furthermore, Mr. President, when our wise forefathers wrote the Constitution of the United States, I believe they wrote the greatest document, except for the Holy Bible, ever penned by the hand of civilized and Christianized man. I believe that if ever there were inspired men the framers of our Constitution were such.

The Constitution of the United States is without doubt patterned after the Holy Bible. Our forebears recognized that there would be many citizens of our Nation who would be believers in God and many who would not be, so they wrote a constitution that would include both classes and at the same time give full protection from a governmental standpoint to each class. They did this by carefully putting down in black and white the individual powers which the citizens of this Nation transferred or delegated to their Federal Government. They were specific in listing these delegated powers. They put them down in one, two, three order. After they had enumerated all the personal powers which the citizens were delegating to their Federal Government they studied the matter further and came to the conclusion that at some time in the future some bright, designing persons might for selfish reasons try to twist the meaning of the delegated personal powers and construe them to mean something utterly different than was intended or was actually written in the Constitution. So they wrote the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, and in amendment X they nailed the meaning down by specifically stating that all powers not therein delegated to the Federal Government, or to State governments, were retained by the people.

Mr. President, the citizens of this Nation retained many powers or rights unto themselves. They retained the right to conduct all private enterprise; the right to worship God; the right of free speech; and many other rights and powers. As a matter of fact there is not one word, syllable, or sentence in the Constitution wherein the people of this Republic ever delegated to their Federal Government the power to exercise charity for them. Consequently, Mr. President, as a duly elected official of the Government I do not have the power to exercise charity on behalf of its citizens, and regardless of the fact that I most sincerely believe in charity, I shall not violate the Constitution of the United States even to do the thing I should like to see done.

I will, as a private citizen, go down into my own pocket and take as much of my personal money as I can afford to contribute to charity. I will give to whomsoever I may choose in any nation on earth, regardless of race, religion, color, or political belief, if such people are hungry or sick and unable to sustain themselves. On the other hand, Mr. President, I will not as a Member of the Senate go into the pockets of other citizens and extract one thin dime by taxation or public borrowing to give it as charity to foreigners. I will not do it because, under the Constitution, I do not possess the authority to do so.

Now, Mr. President, if the people of this Nation want to turn their Government into a charitable organization, it is within their power to do so by the process of amending the Constitution. But I warn them that when that is done, it will be the last of our Republic of free men. When free people delegate to their Government the right to exercise charity for them, they are granting a limitless power to their law makers which will ultimately destroy their Government.

As I have stated, Mr. President, the people of this Nation have the power to amend their Constitution to provide for their Federal Government exercising charity for them. If that is what they want to do, I offer no objection to their exercising that right and privilege. But so long as the Constitution remains as it now is, each citizen has the personal right to exercise his or her own charity individually, or through privately conducted charitable organizations or churches. This is exactly what they have been doing ever since our Government was organized. I have explicit confidence in their continuing to exercise their own charity most generously so long as our Nation exists as a nation of free people, because no greater truth was ever spoken than, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Furthermore, Mr. President, when Government takes over the administration of charity, it will give the people ample excuse for discontinuing personal charity donations to private charitable organizations and churches, and those great humanitarian organizations will be forced to discontinue operations.

Mr. President, one of the main objectives of communism is to destroy worship of God. If, by the process of shifting responsibility for charity from churches to Government, churches can be robbed

of contributions for charity, and as a consequence be stripped of the power to administer aid to poor, hungry, helpless people, will not that help destroy churches and the faith people have in the teachings of our Lord? I think so.

Charity to Europe? Yes, Mr. President, I am in favor of it when granted by individuals or churches and private agencies under private control. I am for this method of aiding Europe to get back on her feet, but when it comes to violating the Constitution of the United States by taxing the American citizen and distributing billions of his dollars in Europe on the theory that we can bribe those nations not to go communistic, I am opposed to the theory, and I have no confidence in the result.

Now, Mr. President, we come to another phase of the general situation in Europe. We are told that there is need for money to be granted to Europe in the form of loans for the rehabilitation of industry.

It is my judgment that the way for loans to be made to Europe for the purpose of rehabilitating industry is for the loans to be made by private individuals in this country who have money to lend, and who will lend it on good, sound business propositions. If the loan will not stand on this basis, then we have no right to call it a grant of credit. We might just as well call it a gift in the first place.

There are many conditions to take into consideration when it comes to building factories and establishing industries. It is not by any means just a matter of raising the capital. It is a matter of selecting the right geographical locations with respect to supply of raw material, and proximity to potential customers. It is a question of acquiring competent and experienced management. It is a proposition of obtaining an adequate supply of contented and willing workers. There are also many other important considerations. This, Mr. President, brings us down to the one and most important question of all, the question of the kind of government under which the industries must operate.

Industries have succeeded in our Nation to such proportions that we are recognized as the greatest industrial nation on earth. Such a growth, Mr. President, is due solely to our system of government, which permits a free private-enterprise economy, with a minimum of Government controls. During the past 16 years there has been a growing tendency to destroy private enterprise by various governmental maneuverings.

Now, let us take a look at the 16 European nations which are supposed to be the beneficiaries of the Marshall plan, supposedly for the purpose of rehabilitating industry. We find they have entirely different forms of government, none of which are like ours. The people of those nations are entitled to adopt any form of government they desire. Surely it is not my purpose to criticize them because of their choice, but the fact remains that England, once the giant of nations, master of the seven seas, and one of the most prosperous and conservative governments of the whole world, has changed over to a socialistic government. This socialistic government is rapidly

taking over England's industries, and is just as rapidly sinking into oblivion, industrially, commercially, financially, and economically.

No system of private industry can possibly succeed under any government that contributes 70 cents per day per person, as England does, to feed its people. It will soon eat itself into bankruptcy. The money we donate to support this unsound and reckless policy is a rank waste, and will bankrupt the United States if continued. Most of the other European nations are in about the same category, many of them worse, possibly some of them not so bad.

Mr. President, the truth is that no system of private industry can succeed under the kind of government England has today. The same comment applies to a greater or lesser degree to every one of the 16 European nations named in the Marshall plan. This argument is supported by the fact that the citizens of those nations having capital to invest have chosen not to invest their capital in industry in their own countries, but to invest it in industries in our country and other nations. They have done this, according to reliable authority, to the extent of eighteen or twenty billions of dollars. Well, this being true, why should foreign fools step in where home folks fear to tread? Nobody contends that we can change the form of government of those 16 European nations. That is unquestionably the exclusive right of the citizens of each nation.

Rehabilitation of Europe's industry? Yes, Mr. President; I favor it when the investments are made by individual citizens of this or any other nation, and from their own funds, without Government financial assistance or Government guaranties against financial loss. Such loans must be made upon the personal judgment of the lender relative to the soundness of the investment and from the standpoint of the character of government under which the industry must operate. But when it comes to giving away to foreign nations our taxpayers' billions, I am opposed to it. Our actions are so silly that even the sensible people in England are laughing at us.

Let me read an article from page 4 of the Sunday Express, printed in London, England, August 3, 1947. Here it is:

A very large section of the population decided that with the election of a socialistic government we had automatically entered the millennium in which work did not matter any more. If you needed money, you had merely to hang out your stocking and Santa Claus would fill it. The Government at the same time decided that if only the United States would lend us sufficient dollars, we could sit back and build the heaven of their dreams without bothering too much about the facts of life. Unfortunately, the United States loaned us the money.

Note that, Mr. President, from this London newspaper:

Unfortunately, the United States loaned us the money. Unfortunately, the money is now nearly exhausted, and, unfortunately, it hasn't done us a bit of good.

I might add, the last cent of this gift of \$3,750,000,000 has been drained off. The article continues:

On the contrary, by our pledges to make sterling debts convertible into dollars on re-

quest and by hog-tying ourselves by the notorious article 9 so that we cannot even move food we need from the larders of the Empire to the homeland's kitchens, we have brought disaster upon us.

So, here, Mr. President, we have a perfect example of our Government being eager to bankrupt our own Nation by shoveling out billions of dollars to a socialistic nation, while their newspapers accuse us of bringing disaster upon their nation by forcing those billions upon them. Of course, nobody expects the British loan to be repaid, and anyone who gave the matter any study knew before the loan was made that it would never be paid. And all the money our Government is pouring down every rat hole in every foreign nation on earth is not only hastening our own day of financial disaster, but it is laying the foundation to make every foreign nation hate us when the day finally comes when we shall be forced by circumstances to stop shoveling out our money to them.

Mr. President, I believe in giving the people the absolute truth about all legislation. We cannot enact laws which leave the people on the outside looking in. Every law the Congress enacts directly affects the people and for this reason alone the people should be given all the facts regarding any legislation. In the case of the program we are now considering, the people have not been given all the truth. They have been fed largely upon pure fiction and half-truths. They have had a picture of sheer fantasy dangled before their eyes by the bureaucratic propaganda experts, when they should have been shown the honest, naked truth.

Huge sums of money have been spent on radio and public print to implant in the minds of our American citizens the specter of starvation hovering over the homes in all European lands, but nothing has been told our people of the sad results which will inevitably come to them if we are to continue the looting of our own treasure house. Nothing has been said by these bureaucratic propagandists about robbing our oil stores, our coal pits, our iron mines through this give-away program so that Uncle Sam may appear in the role of Peter the Giver to the European politicians. The real cost of this program to the American citizen, to his State, and his community, is studiously avoided, for the proponents of the plan know full well that to give the American people the whole truth would be to rob themselves of the glory they hope to reap from putting over this wasteful program.

Mr. President, the Marshall program will probably cost the people of my State of Texas more than a billion dollars before we see the last of it. The present dole is but the entering wedge for things to come. It will not prevent war nor will it stop the greedy aggressions of the Russian bear, but it will play a most important role in degrading and pauperizing this beautiful land of ours.

Now I come to another phase in the discussion which I feel will help the people to form a clearer picture of where we are headed. What I have to say now is in the form of a refresher course to polish up on things that have happened and

which I believe have a direct bearing upon any and all things promulgated by and indulged in by our so-called master strategists. And, by the way, Mr. President, I am one who is sick and tired of being told that I must follow any and all schemes because this Mr. Big or that Mr. Big is for the thing. This sort of propagandizing has become a cheap racket, and a low device to trap unsuspecting or unthinking people.

In the appraisals of foreign affairs which have been given to the American people for the past 8 or 10 years, estimates have been uniformly wrong. I am sure many Senators remember the statement made by the then President of the United States, in an address in Boston on October 30, 1940, when he said:

And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers I give you one more assurance; I have said this before but I shall say it again, and again, and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that by its very existence it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. The purpose of our defense is defense.

I am not uncharitable enough to say that the President of the United States was dishonest with the people, that he was not sincere with the people. I think the facts are that he simply did not know. I think most of us remember that the people of America were told, when we finally got into the war, that we got into it to protect the rights of all the small nations of Europe as well as the large ones. We were told that we were fighting a war for the maintenance of the democratic form of government. Do you think, Mr. President, these statements were insincere statements? Do you think, even though the statements came to us from the executive department of Government, that those who made them were dishonest? Certainly it would be uncharitable to reach such a conclusion; so I believe the answer must be that those who were conducting our foreign affairs simply did not know.

Do you think, Mr. President, when the great principles of the Atlantic Charter were broadcast to the people of this Nation, when the people were told we were fighting a war to liberate the peoples of the nations of Europe from dictatorship, that it was an insincere statement? Or again, do you think it was simply a statement made by those who did not know Europe and did not know the conditions which we would face when the war was over? Do you think that all the glowing reports which we received following conferences with Russia at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam were mere fiction, made out of whole cloth, and distributed to the American people to mislead them? Or do you think that the executive department of our Government was sincere in what it told the public, but simply was misinformed? Do you think, Mr. President, that they were dishonest or do you think they were simply mistaken?

I am inclined to accept the more charitable view and say that all these series of errors came about because of the fact that the executive department of Government, including our State Department, simply did not know. But there is one thing the American people do

know today; they know that through the process of negotiation and with the acceptance and approval of the executive department, Joe Stalin has been firmly planted in control of most of the Balkan countries, half of Germany, all of Czechoslovakia, and that he has taken over a large part of Poland, and made vassal states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, with Finland on the way.

In other words, through negotiation with those who are charged with handling the foreign affairs of this Nation we find Joe Stalin has actually been given control of about one-half of Europe.

But the executive departments of this Government, including the State Department, tell us that this plan of vast loans or gifts to Europe is the only remedy. I might have more confidence in the recommendations of the executive departments of Government and in the recommendations of the State Department if it had not been for the fact that their batting average thus far has been so miserably low.

Mr. President, I have discussed the so-called Marshall plan according to the numerous and various claims that have been made for it and according to the way the bill in printed form came to this Senate floor. But there is another side to this story. It is the side which has not been mentioned. Perhaps some may think it unwise to discuss the true conditions which face us, but I prefer to be open and frank and place all the cards on the table face up.

The cold, stark, naked truth is that World War II is still in progress. Our fine American sons, on the fields of battle, beat Germany, Italy, and Japan into complete and unconditional surrender, just as they started out to do; but after they won the war our diplomats lost the peace. Our executive department failed to understand that it takes just as strong military forces to win the peace as it takes to win the war. So they disbanded our military forces, gave much of our military equipment to greedy aggressors, adopted a program to give away our resources by the billions, and attempted to write the peace treaties over cocktail glasses.

They have failed miserably and are now trying to cover up their failures by giving away more billions of dollars. All the billions we have shipped to Europe since the war have gone down the sewer, and everybody must admit that the conditions over there are more dangerous now than they were before we sent a single dollar. Dollar soldiers will not win the peace.

When the two world's greatest tyrant aggressors, Hitler and Stalin, met to carve up and divide Poland, they proved themselves to be partners in crime. That pair played true to gang rules—either fight together or separately, or fight each other, but conquer. Hitler was eliminated, but Stalin kept marching on. He never stopped one moment. We may call it nazism, fascism, or communism, or any other ism, but its real name is atheism.

This world is now embroiled in the most terrible religious war the world has ever witnessed. It is a global conflict. Stalin is carrying the Communist flag at

the head of the evil forces. The objective is world revolution, a communistic dictatorship, and enslavement of the masses in every nation of the world. This is Stalin's program. It has always been the Communist program. Communism is founded upon this sadistic philosophy.

Mr. President, with the whole world in turmoil and confusion, I cannot give my approval to a colossal give-away plan of billions of our resources when it is plain to see that the billions already given have been completely wasted. I think this give-away policy is the wrong approach to the solution of our own and world problems. Whenever it is decided by the people of this Nation, through their authorized representatives, that our Nation is in danger from without, I am willing to go all-out with all the resources at our command to defend and preserve our Nation. But if we continue to follow the path of trying to bribe or pacify the enemies of freedom and liberty with dollars, it will only weaken our economy and can very easily weaken it to the point where we may be unable to successfully wage war with the only weapons that world bandits and global aggressors can understand and respect.

Mr. President, no one has condemned Communism more than I have, and few started condemning it earlier than I did. I want to clean it out here at home, where it has become entrenched in our Government, in leadership of our labor unions, in our schools, and, sad to say, in our churches. Also I want to do everything we can to stamp it out elsewhere.

I recognize our responsibility in world affairs and am willing for our Government to assume full responsibility and world leadership for a just peace, but I am not in favor of the Marshall plan as it is now before us, because I do not believe it will accomplish this highly desired end. In fact, I believe it will do much harm. It is totally impracticable. We need to adopt an entirely different plan.

We need to keep our own record clean by eradicating all Communists and communistic or socialistic sympathizers from Government service.

We need to readopt the Constitution of the United States of America. We need to free our private enterprise system of all governmental strangulation and governmental competition.

We need to reduce Government expense and take the heavy load off of our overburdened taxpayers. We must reestablish a sound government and a realistic system of free private enterprise to support a sound government.

If we do this our economy will become strong enough to support an army and navy and air force so strong and powerful that no nation or combination of nations will ever dare attack us.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the Marshall give-away plan. I am in favor of adding to the Marshall plan billions in appropriations for a strong military defense.

I am in favor of billions for defense to protect and safeguard our nation, our people, our homes, our liberty, our freedom, and everything we hold dear—yes, billions to assure peace to all freedom-loving peoples in all nations of the world.

Mr. President, I am in favor of billions for defense for the perpetuation of our American way of life for ourselves here at home as provided under our constitutional system of Government, but not one cent to sustain or bolster tottering socialistic and communistic governments, which have never given freedom, prosperity, or happiness to the people of their countries at anytime. Let us be fair, let us be honest, let us be practical, Mr. President; and above all, let us be truthful with the American people.

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Overton
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Capper	Kilgore	Stennis
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Dworschak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tobey
Eaton	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Moore	Wilson
Green	Murray	
Gurney	O'Connor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I never rise in the Senate for the purpose of hearing my voice, to entertain the galleries, or to make a little noise. I have made it a point to rise when I thought I could contribute something to my fellow Senators, at least to the extent that they would think about what I suggested, not with the idea even of convincing them or with the idea of having them admit that everything I said was correct, but merely in my humble way to place an idea within their minds and to see whether or not by thinking about the idea we might be able better to understand all the ramifications of the legislation that might be pending.

While we are discussing the European recovery program, or ECA, as it is sometimes called, I deem it proper to discuss a problem in this hemisphere that, in my opinion, is a part and parcel of the success of the European recovery program.

The recovery program, as I understand it, is to be accomplished by furnishing material and financial assistance to the participating countries and other countries, including any of the zones of the occupied territory of Germany, any areas under international administration or

control and the free territory of Trieste. I take it that is what let us in certain countries that are not designated by name.

We all know that the term "furnishing materials" includes many things. It may include food commodities, machinery, factories, machine tools, heavy equipment, gasoline, and fuel oil.

Much has been said here of late about our shortage of oil, and there is no question that we are short of oil. Other countries of this continent could aid materially not only in helping us furnish supplies, including oil, to carry out the European recovery program, but could also aid materially in breaking the fuel shortage—all in keeping with the philosophy of the European recovery program and also with our boasted good-neighbor policy, if we mean it. I for one believe we mean it, notwithstanding the handicaps which are interposed by private individuals and private industry in carrying out the good-neighbor policy.

Mr. President, on February 28, 1947, President Truman visited Mexico City and there delivered an address to the Mexican people. In that speech the President reiterated how the good-neighbor policy applies to international relations the same standards of conduct that prevail among self-respecting individuals within a democratic community, and he concluded his remarks by saying, "Our two countries will not fail each other." Latin Americans as a whole believed those words of President Truman. How does this affect oil? I shall undertake to show how.

I have stated that there is a shortage of oil, and there is. Much has been said about the production of oil in Saudi Arabia, and it is known that most of our equipment for the production of oil is now going to Saudi Arabia, thousands of miles away.

I hope that Senators who have been patient and courteous enough to remain here while I address the Senate will listen closely to the remarks that I am about to make.

In the case of an emergency and a war can we depend on the production of oil in Saudi Arabia or does it behoove us, notwithstanding our efforts to get oil there, to do something to produce oil which can be obtained at our back door? The oil potentials of Mexico are large and with the permission of the Senate, I am going to talk about them, because they are directly across an artificial line from our own country, and not within striking distance of the people whose aggressions the Senate is trying to prevent—the Russians.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was unfortunately called from the floor a moment ago. I understand the Senator is now addressing himself to the subject of Saudi Arabia, and I understand the Senator's position to be that there are proved oil fields within the United States and within the Western Hemisphere. I know it is difficult to follow the work of all the committees, but if the Senator has followed the work of the Small Business Committee closely, I am sure he recalls the statement made that we are at present behind

in this country to the extent of 67,000 oil wells, either wildcat wells or wells in proved territory. I missed a portion of the Senator's remarks, which I deeply regret. Is it the Senator's feeling that, as a matter of national security and of keeping our petroleum production efficient and up to standard, having the equipment to do so, it is essential we continue to produce, and to bring in new wells in the United States and in the Western Hemisphere for that very purpose?

Mr. CHAVEZ. And to bring in other wells 6 feet away from the border of the United States. The Senator understands me correctly, and if he will only be patient enough to follow what I shall have to say, I am sure I can convince him and anyone else who is willing to be convinced that we are neglecting something that is of importance even in the matter of national defense.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall listen with interest to the Senator's remarks. I deeply appreciate the interest of the Senator, who has always taken more than casual interest in every subject matter of which he speaks. I realize, too, that the Senator is an authority on the production of oil.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The subject may be approached from various standpoints. It may be approached from the standpoint of national defense, which is our business. It may be approached from the standpoint of giving effect to the good-neighbor policy. It may also be approached from the standpoint of giving effect to the program we are now discussing.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know that the Department of Commerce has issued an export license for 33,000 tons of steel, to be exported to Saudi Arabia as its quota?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have the figures on my desk.

Mr. President, the world-wide shortage of crude petroleum—probably the most essential natural resource for all present day industrial activity—is universally recognized as an alarming and lamentable fact. It is not too much to say that, in our own time, the dearth of oil may retard in most costly manner the continued growth of commerce and, indeed, profoundly affect, adversely, the development of modern civilization. From a nationalistic standpoint having in mind the matter of our national defense, a severe lack of oil, in the opinion of military experts, could easily be catastrophic in its effects upon our national safety. For no wheel of industry or of war can turn upon its axle without oil. That is axiomatic. We all know that to be so.

The shortage of crude petroleum is not revealed in figures of a declining production of that vital product. Crude oil production of the United States and of the world is currently breaking all records. Even so, however, the huge production volumes are unable to keep pace with the ever-increasing demands of the modern age. Although the United States is today producing approximately twice as much oil as it was producing a decade ago, nevertheless, our supply and demand relationship is so alarmingly serious as to

lead our experts to the belief that shortage of supply is of such nature as to jeopardize the national security and to threaten our means of national defense.

The Secretary of Defense recently has informed the Congress and the Nation that if war, unfortunately, should be thrust upon us, our immediate requirements for oil, in order to enable us to conduct modern warfare in our defense, would be 2,000,000 more barrels daily than our present capacity to produce. Realizing the vital danger of such a circumstance, both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior have gone on record as favoring the immediate building of a synthetic-oil industry to cost, possibly, the stupendous amount of approximately \$9,000,000,000, not to mention the length of time necessary for the building of such a huge new industry. These official expressions of opinion and the solemn recommendations directed toward such tremendous effort in the attempt to provide an adequate supply of this most vital product indicate the threatening grave consequences that may befall us if the problem of scarcity cannot be solved. The situation, therefore, demands exhaustive and careful search for every possible source that may satisfy the need for more oil. New oil reserves, more abundant oil fields, are the need of the hour.

The search for oil has stimulated our interest and directed a considerable part of our effort toward developing areas located even in remote parts of the world and many thousands of miles from our own shores. These operations involve investments totaling hundreds of millions of dollars, and hazards not only incident to the nature of such business, but also involving possible international complications that call attention forcefully to the difficulties, the risks, even the wisdom of such ventures. Yet the vital need of the world for this essential product and the great relative scarcity of it impel the relentless search and the almost frantic development of large deposits wherever they are known to exist. Indeed, the acquisition and control of such deposits are jealously guarded as prized possessions of prime importance to the needs of nations.

I am cognizant of the recommendations of our Defense Secretary for the sending of large quantities of steel to far-off Saudi Arabia for use in developing the prodigious deposits of oil known to exist in that fortunate or unfortunate land. I am in favor of the development of oil reserves wherever found in the world, for I realize the need of the world economy for more and more oil. I am of the opinion, however, that, in our zeal to accomplish more in the way of adding to the world's production of oil, we have overlooked a great opportunity, an opportunity close at home and available in the land of a friendly, next-door neighbor. I speak of Mexico.

In the opinion of oil experts, Mexico is a land, blessed like regions in our own country offsetting her immediately to the north, with huge oil deposits ranking with the greatest of the earth. Mexico already has produced billions of barrels of crude petroleum from only a small portion of the areas held to be prospec-

tive producing fields probably capable of yielding many more billion barrels of this much needed product. The area has not yet been scratched. I am referring to the area of Mexico next door to the United States, not an area 10,000 miles away. The Mexican Government has undertaken an extensive program designed both to develop fully present producing oil fields and, as well, to explore, discover and develop still additional new fields. There are millions of barrels of oil across from Laredo and Del Rio, Tex., within a hundred miles of the oil fields in the State of New Mexico. It is a tremendous potential, lying next door to us, with refineries located in the State of Texas.

This effort on the part of our neighbor republic is a most worthy one and should redound greatly to the benefit of her own national economy as well as, indeed, to contribute substantially to world needs—incidentally, no doubt, allowing our own country a fair and proportionate participation. The discovery and development of huge oil reserves on our own North American Continent will be recognized, even by a lay person, as a matter of the greatest and most important moment, so far as continental defense is concerned, and surely must be regarded as a project highly to be desired. Every possible aid to further such a program should be readily forthcoming with at least equal effectiveness to the encouragement given development programs many thousands of miles away. To fail to give such notice would be to neglect the development of an economy close at home, thus to place us at disadvantage in the possible utilization of oil production within easy accessibility in time of peace and relatively easy to defend in time of war. To neglect the development of such a petroleum economy should justify our severe condemnation.

It is gratifying to learn that our Secretary of State recently informed the press that, in view of certain world conditions, our Government now is looking to Latin America for additional supplies of oil. In addition to the fact that our State Department now apparently is favorably inclined toward the discovery and development of oil reserves to the south, I am advised that American oil refiners, greatly in need of additional crude oil to enable them to continue refining operations, look with hope to any steps which may increase production in the territories of our southern neighbors. It seems to me, therefore, that the purpose of Mexico to proceed substantially in the direction of the attempted discovery and development of huge oil deposits known to exist in that country justifies our giving consideration to every possible aid in cooperation with Mexico in that regard. Such a policy on our part must be a constructive one, definitely within the so-called national interest of our country. Any lay person will quickly perceive the vital importance to the United States, both in times of peace and of war, of the presence, immediately across our southern friendly border, of large oil-producing regions.

It is a matter of current knowledge that operations to be conducted in Mexico in the effort to carry out the develop-

ment program already started there will require considerable amounts of steel products, and it is true, of course, that the entire enterprise is vitally dependent upon such deliveries. The enterprise, in fact, cannot go forward in face of a complete absence of the required steel, and it is an unfortunate fact that steel is being denied for this great project. This situation brings me to a discussion of our national policy with respect to the allocation of steel from American mills for shipments abroad and raises immediately the relative value of the different oil development enterprises abroad that are demanding shipments of steel from American mills.

The fact is that the business of developing oil resources in our neighbor country, Mexico, is now obstructed because of pressure for development elsewhere, and since this "elsewhere" happens to be some 8,000 to 10,000 miles away from our own American shores, the question of policy as to the advisability of neglecting the development of a near-at-hand economy in favor of one in a remote part of the world comes directly to the fore. In that connection, I wish to go on record as stating that mine is a "North America First" policy. I do not agree that no consideration is more important to this country than oil in the Middle East.

The oil of Mexico, the oil of Colombia, the oil of Venezuela, are more important to us than the oil of Saudi Arabia. Mr. Sumner Welles about 10 days ago said, "Suppose we had it and something happened. Would we have it the next day?" But we could have this Mexican oil the next day. I insist that oil in Mexico, a friendly next-door neighbor, as the President said, is worth more to this country, from the simple standpoint of easy and safe accessibility, both in peace and in war, than that found on the back door step of Russia, on the other side of the world. Would Russia attack the wells of Mexico or of the United States, or would she attack those in Saudi Arabia? A child could answer the question.

Why should a huge oil combine be favored in the development and exploitation of an oil reserve far away, certain to require tremendous cost in dollars and possibly a great future cost in the lives of young Americans to defend it, while nothing whatsoever is allowed to function by way of providing even a small amount of needed supplies to further a legitimate enterprise directed exclusively to the development of our own North American economy? If Congress is to be led or misled, stampeded or cajoled by the executive officers of the Government into aiding every expensive venture far from our homes, and related to the development and exploitation—for the sole benefit of a great oil combine—of the natural resources of foreign peoples whose welfare is unrelated to influences vitally affecting either our own national economy or our national defense, why should not the Congress the more wisely be expected to address itself to the business of aiding in the development of our own section of the world to the greater advantage of all of us who live here?

Looking unflinchingly at the face of stark reality, the situation today is one

in which major oil concerns are demanding for themselves practically all the casing that is coming from the entire steel-mill capacity of America. In other words, the major oil companies have cornered the steel market for oil-well supplies. There is law against the cornering of the stock market. There is a law against the cornering of the wheat market. There is a law against the cornering of the cotton and other markets. Laws today are in effect to protect the public interest against the sheer weight of money when used to corner, for a few predatory folk, the basic necessities requisite for the maintenance of the general welfare. The general welfare is what we should be interested in.

In the present instance there may be no law or no arm of our Government which can function toward the solution of this steel problem. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will have a solution.

I should like to invite attention again to the fact that of all the basic forms of wealth, oil is the natural resource most essential to all forms of industrial activity. The protection and the guaranty of a sound and continuing development of the North American petroleum economy, therefore, fall within the musts for consideration of a government that is dedicated to the principle, among others, of promoting the general welfare and providing for a common defense. Providing for the common defense, so far as we are concerned, should start right here.

It is an unhealthy condition for any industry when a few dominating agencies of the industry control its basic element of supply. It will be a sorry day for the world at large when the American oil monopoly must be recognized as controlling, exclusively, the world's most-treasured and most-needed natural resource. If capitalism ever contributed to the cause of a world war, as many of our people believe, we most certainly then must see its performance to that end.

Under present circumstances it appears impossible for Mexico to obtain supplies necessary to put her oil-development program into full operation. In the face of this condition of fact, our Defense Secretary has appeared before Congress with a "first consideration" proposition calling for the shipment to Arabia of some one-half million additional tons of steel for use of oil companies there, instead of what was mentioned, a half million additional tons of steel. It is difficult to understand how anyone can plead for action that would make it easy for an oil corporation to take unto itself, for foreign fields afar, 500,000 tons of steel without which North American enterprises could not exist.

I wish to state that in my references here to Arabia I am not particularly opposed, personally, to the Arabian project, per se. As a matter of fact, I am not at all concerned if the entire world desires to dump prodigious amounts of steel upon the Arabian Peninsula, providing, of course, it has it to dump, and also providing that in the dumping process complete neglect of the development of the North American economy does not result. As this condition of affairs

is exactly what is happening, however, I feel impelled to make references to some of the obvious features in the program which affect the welfare of the people of our own continent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, would the Senator yield at that point, or would he prefer to continue?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A statement was made a moment ago relative to steel allocated to the Saudi Arabia field being in the amount of 500,000 tons, as the Senator has stated. The figure I used, as I remember, which appeared in the testimony adduced by the Small Business Committee, was in the neighborhood of from 440,000 to 460,000 tons for the complete construction of the trans-Arabian pipe line and the producing facilities around the eastern part of the peninsula from which the oil comes.

If I remember correctly, however—and the Senator can correct me if I am wrong—360,000 tons of that steel was to go into the pipe line itself. The remainder was to go into the producing field.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Drilling equipment, and so forth.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. When the Small Business Committee discovered what was going on, it took the matter up in executive session with the agencies involved, because the members of the committee felt that the position taken by the agencies was that it did not make any difference in what part of the world petroleum fields were developed; that if petroleum fields were developed anywhere the result would be to help solve the world-petroleum problem. Of course, that argument has considerable merit. On the other hand, at that time much evidence was submitted by those in high military position, by those interested in the national security and in the general welfare—to which the able Senator from New Mexico has referred—who testified that while it was true that the development of the Saudi-Arabian oil fields would mean that oil could be shipped quickly and at less cost to European nations needing oil, yet if steel were allocated in a considerable amount for the development of oil fields in the Western Hemisphere it would mean that oil in sufficient quantity could be had by us not only in time of peace, but in time of war, which would be a very potent weapon in our hands, if needed.

The question then came down to the point: What is the emergency for building a pipe line in Saudi Arabia? The answer was that transportation was involved; that oil could be furnished more quickly and more cheaply from such fields to Europe. It finally developed from the evidence adduced that it was merely a question of a lower rate of transportation. But it was pointed out that an emergency existed here in our country, because there was a shortage of oil, so there was need for developing fields in our country and close to our country, in Mexico.

Oil fields can be developed in Mexico economically, if only sufficient steel can be secured for the purpose. The development of the Saudi-Arabian pipe line

would furnish a cheaper means of transportation than shipment of oil through the Suez Canal, but inasmuch as the oil contemplated to be obtained from such development would not be available until 1952, the contention was that we should proceed to the development of fields in the Western Hemisphere; that wildcatting should be encouraged, and that wells should be drilled in the proven fields in order to increase production in the Western Hemisphere. It was shown that such production would be necessary to promote the general welfare and provide for the common defense of our own country.

As I previously stated, the argument was advanced by some that it made no difference where oil fields were located; that as each new field was developed it would tend to help in solving the problem of the world-wide shortage of oil. But, as I further stated, evidence was also adduced which confirms the position taken by the able Senator from New Mexico, that if possible, the oil should be produced in proven fields in our own country and in fields in Mexico, and in Latin America. Such production, as I have stated, would serve to promote the general welfare and provide for the common defense of the United States, and would also serve as a means of promoting a good-will policy toward our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, my suggestion is simple. I have no objection whatsoever to the development of Saudi-Arabian oil fields, but I do object to the oil companies securing all the steel which is now produced in the United States, and transporting it to Saudi Arabia for the development of fields over there, which will not be of value to us in promoting our national defense or our national economy.

By nature's law and by nature's God, the development of the North American economy is a natural duty imposed upon the people of Canada, the people of the United States, and the people of Mexico. Their economy is a homogeneous economy, and the destinies of all the people who are compelled to live upon it depend, in the ultimate, directly upon the manner of their behavior in developing, exploiting, and utilizing it. In this great duty and in this great destiny, Canada, the United States, and Mexico find themselves bound together as natural partners. As such, each possesses a part and parcel of the whole and is morally bound, for the general welfare of the entire continent, not only to shoulder the burden of its own responsibility toward developing the continent's natural resources, but also to aid another partner, if necessary, to get under way with the same kind of work. Our Chief Executive recently very solemnly has pledged, both to the peoples of Mexico and to those of Canada, the full cooperation of the United States in this very regard.

Mr. President, I hope that what will be done under the pending legislation will be of ultimate good to the world at large. I would not object to an appropriation of three times the amount called for in the bill, and to having the money sent to Europe, if the people of Europe

would in turn set to work, and, by using what we give to them, do everything within their power to place their own economy on its feet.

Three or four days ago representatives from the State Department appeared before a committee of Congress. From what was said in that committee it appears that it is proposed to dangle \$600,000,000 before the countries of Latin America. Is it better to give away to them \$600,000,000, or is it better to sell them something of practical value in developing their own industries, their own natural resources, so we can receive something in return? What is the common sense of the matter? The difficulty is that we are all the time dangling dollars. We should use a little common sense in approaching the problem of what to do which would be of ultimate benefit to the United States, to Latin America, to Mexico, and to the world at large. We should indulge in some common-sense horse trading. Let us give to Latin American countries some of the steel which is going to Saudi Arabia and let them use it in an attempt to work out their own salvation. From whom would they buy the things they need, if they were secure economically? They would buy from the United States. The United States should help them develop their oil fields and other natural resources. If oil fields are developed close to home it will mean much to us in the way of providing a means for our own defense.

Mr. President, having in mind our natural duty toward our good and friendly neighbors in this great and divinely constituted partnership and, as well, the pledge of our country's Chief in that self-same direction, who among us can be justified now in coming forward to advocate the sapping of our economic strength, the stultifying of our growth, by removing our treasure beyond the reach of all of us, by denying the steel necessary to protect our competitive system in the developing of our North American petroleum reserves—who can do this for the sake of aiding in the development of an economy, strange and unnatural to us, far away from us in a remote part of the world, and subject to the will of foreign peoples who very possibly could become future potential enemies of ours or at least easy prey for future potential enemies of our country?

More and more of the American people are becoming sick at heart because of our foolish governmental tendency to give away so substantially of our substance when the gift has to do with purely non-American issues and whilst such policy denies the goods which, under wiser direction, could be used to develop the economy of North America—our home and our next-door neighbors' homes. To be concrete can anyone tell me any sound reason why Mexico should be completely unable to find assistance in her struggle to buy steel from steel mills in America when the Secretary of Defense can so willingly come before us and advocate the shipment thousands of miles away of hundreds of thousands of tons of steel?

Mr. President, I maintain that I am just as patriotic as is the Secretary of Defense.

The defense of America argument surely carries no weight in these considerations for is there a military man worthy of a decoration who will stress the easy defense by us of the Arabian oil fields and their long extended pipe-line system while, at the same time overlooking what is obvious even to the lay person, namely the relatively easy defense of Mexican oil fields, situated as they are on the very porch of the United States of America and constituting a definite portion of the North American economy of which we are such an integral part? In the defense of America our military must defend and can defend our own continent. In any war against a great power dominant in the Middle East, our military would encounter far different and more difficult problems in defending the Arabian oil holding of a few big oil concerns whose policies now selfishly deny even the development of the great and yet undiscovered oil reserves of our sister republic just south of our own border. Logic of our entire present policy in this regard suggests a complete revaluing and, indeed revamping of it. Let us not foolishly follow imperialistic policy to a point of development of large foreign oil fields to dangle before a future enemy as a bite to be taken in one huge gulp on the first unfortunate day of attack. Let us build within the fences around our own shores an economy prosperous and strong enough always to defend ourselves and to make America secure in the world—not a nation to be sapped of her strength by giving away the very substance of nature's gifts with which she has been so bounteously blessed and which now are so essentially needed at home in the development of her own economy. How can this nation of ours, in the face of expressions on the part of our President, whose avowed purpose is to aid our neighbor, Mexico, deny now the development of the Mexican petroleum economy whilst feeding to far off Arabia steel that is essentially required to make good the promise to Mexico?

Answer to this question can be found only in a keen perception of the nature of the influences apparently working among the personnel and the various departments of the executive branch of our government. I charge that too many of our executive officials give too sympathetic ear to the blandishments, the arguments, the subtle propaganda, the one-sided presentations of paid representatives of big oil corporations. I charge that these representatives are well known and well received by our State Department and that a relationship and an acquaintance exists there that makes for bad sledding for the competitors of such big oil corporations in that certain of our public officials do things for these big combines whilst damning enterprises in which they have no participation. But first I must state that in 1938 the Mexican government expropriated, with most excellent reasons in my opinion, the oil properties in Mexico which large American oil corporations for many years had exploited.

Let me give an instance of how they operate. I am willing to make this statement in Wall Street or anywhere else

where I would not be protected by congressional immunity. I wish to tell what an oil man said to me. He had been the manager of a corporation in Mexico for 28 years. I arrived in Mexico City 5 or 6 days after expropriation. When I went into the lobby of the hotel, I met him. I knew him well. He said, "Dennis, let us have a Scotch and soda." So we went to have a Scotch and soda. While there he said, "Things are bad." I knew what he was talking about, namely, expropriation. I said, "What is bad?" He said, "This fellow is crazy." I said, "What fellow?" He was talking about the President of Mexico. After he talked to me, the President of Mexico went up in my estimation.

I said, "Why is he crazy?" He bluntly replied, "He will not take a dime. We used to be able to handle such officials with money and in other ways, but this fellow is crazy. He will not take a dime."

He was talking about the President of Mexico. So the President of Mexico began to go up in my estimation.

The large oil companies used to operate by murder, arson, and robbery. I know American businessmen who would like to go down there and do an honest business, and make money for themselves without robbing the people of Mexico. They would like to produce oil for the United States, and bring a little money into Mexico so that the Mexicans could buy from the United States. But Big Business wants to get in there under its own terms. That is why the small operators are not getting steel.

These expropriated companies today are keenly desirous of returning to Mexico—on their own terms and in the old way—to develop and to exploit forevermore the greatest known wealth of the Mexican Nation. These companies are jealous of any independent enterprise that gives promise of developing, on any fair basis other than one which they, themselves control, the great petroleum reserves of Mexico.

There consequently now exists an effective conspiracy against operations for the development of the oil reserves of Mexico badly needed as this development is. The participants in this conspiracy are certain of the big oil companies and of the big steel companies working in perfect concert to deny the steel requisite for this program.

It is a fact that the steel companies of America, through their subsidiary supply companies or their supply house representatives, follow a definite policy of cultivating their so-called Big Business oil company customers and that the steel companies, through their supply or sales organizations, look to the protection of such Big Business customers by seeing to it that such customers receive a preference when the matter of deliveries of steel supplies is involved. I further charge that supply houses, in deference to their steel company masters, refuse specifically to sell steel casing that is known to be desired for the purpose of use in Mexico, and that the steel companies act in concert with the big oil corporations to this end. Conversely to this line, however, it is known that at least one large oil company, at a time of severe shortage of steel casing, has been

supplied freely by the steel companies with such immense quantities of that particular much-needed product that the company finds itself today possessed of more of such supplies at its properties in the Middle East than it can use for the next 2 years.

I realize the difficulty in coping against such powerful and sinister forces as are found in the world's huge monopolies today. But in the tie-up of the great oil and steel organizations, clothed in hypocrisy and strangely nurtured by influential channels of our own Government, will be found the modus operandi that not only gives driving power to the very grave and dangerous threat that exists today not only for individual initiative and free enterprise in America but also constitutes sabotage of our good-neighbor policy and of our efforts toward continental and hemispherical defense.

That is what ruined the Rio Conference. That is what ruined the Habana Conference. That is what ruins the work of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Texas in Mexico City. That is what ruins the good-neighbor policy. The monopolists wish to control things for their own selfish purposes.

Within the past few days the State Department has advised Congress that a hemispheric recovery program is contemplated, suggesting to Congress that it appropriate \$600,000,000 for that purpose. I presume it will be more or less of the nature of the program we are now considering.

In my opinion, it might be necessary to appropriate that amount; but if we can do a little trading with those countries in the ordinary American way without trying to influence them, I believe that they can solve their own problems.

Two or three days ago I heard the suggestion that one of the reasons we had to rush this program through and appropriate the money it calls for was the election in Italy. It is a violation of at least the spirit of the Hatch Act for us to appropriate money merely because there is an election in Italy. We might as well stop such use of the mighty dollar. The mighty dollar should be used as a medium of exchange. Let them earn the mighty dollar and help develop their country in that way. That will do more good than dangling before the eyes of our neighbors \$600,000,000 for hemispheric recovery. Dollars are all well and good, but we shall not have recovery in the Western Hemisphere by supplying dollars alone. Talking of supplying \$600,000,000 might have some effect on the representatives of foreign governments in their meeting at the end of this month at Bogota, but it will not bring about economic recovery anywhere. Mr. President, recovery must come at least in part from the efforts of those who wish to achieve recovery. For instance, it will come by having them plant beans or grow cotton or raise other crops rather than by simply having \$600,000,000 dangled before them.

The State Department can do more for its program by insisting that American industry, especially the steel industry, furnish Mexico with oil machinery to develop its potentials. That can

and should be done. Then it could be proved to Latin America that we are good neighbors. Then we could also relieve the oil shortage.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1174) to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2202) to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in subsection (a) of section 11, the Administrator shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this act, utilize private channels of trade.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this amendment was previously offered in printed form, but I have modified it to some extent.

As the amendment now stands, it simply provides that the Administrator in procuring, processing, transporting, or repairing any of the commodities which he may acquire under this act, shall utilize so far as possible private channels of trade. This amendment has the approval of the State Department, and I think it has the approval of the chairman of the committee. In fact, it is implicit in the bill itself, but it is not spelled out in the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the able Senator from Georgia. The consideration of the bill in the committee itself constantly emphasized the basic principle which is here stated. So far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, he considers it highly appropriate that the directive should be asserted as indicated in the pending proposal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia state for me his interpretation of subsection (c), the one preceding his amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. That is an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I should prefer to have him interpret it. The amendment I am offering has nothing to do with that one.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. GEORGE. All this proposed new subsection is intended to do, Mr. President, is to have the Administrator utilize private channels of trade for procuring and preparing the commodities which he is to acquire. The whole purpose of the amendment is to have those commodities and the services on them secured on a competitive basis, and also to forestall the possibility of the creation of a wholly unnecessary bureaucracy for procurement purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment just adopted, I wish to make a brief statement, similar to the one I made in respect to the interim-aid bill, regarding freight forwarders and other elements in the normal channels of transportation.

In this bill authority is given for the transportation of supplies to the recipient nations. As is stated in the committee report, however, it is intended that the normal channels of transportation are to be used to the maximum extent practicable to handle these cargoes—which is precisely what the amendment of the Senator from Georgia indicates in a broader sense.

Not only does this envisage the use of privately owned ships, but it is also our intention that private freight-forwarding channels, where normally utilized for handling cargo, shall be used to service any similar cargoes shipped under this bill. In rare cases, of course, such use of commercial forwarders might interfere with the efficient and economical handling of cargoes, and consequently would be undesirable. However, it is our position that ERP cargoes should in almost all cases be handled in accordance with the purposes of section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, usually referred to as the Bland Freight Forwarding Act. It is not intended that Government agencies supplant or take over the functions normally performed by private-enterprise freight forwarders.

Mr. President, I wish to make this additional comment regarding what has just been placed in the bill: I hope it will satisfy the junior Senator from Kansas in respect to the first part of the amendment he has offered in regard to the handling of wheat and flour, an amendment which is still on the clerk's desk awaiting subsequent consideration.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kentucky has two amendments to submit. One of them is completely without controversy. I suggest that he send that amendment forward first.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, between lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

WESTERN HEMISPHERE COUNTRIES

SEC. 16. The President shall take appropriate steps to encourage all countries in the Western Hemisphere to make available to participating countries such assistance as they may be able to furnish.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Kentucky, the purpose to which he directs his amendment is certainly implicit in the entire plan. The success of the objective which he underscores is highly essential to the success of the entire enterprise. So far as I am concerned, I should be very happy to have the amendment incorporated into the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished Senator and say to him that his work on the European recovery plan holds my great admiration and respect. I have submitted the amendment to emphasize that if the European recovery program is to succeed, it will need not only the assistance which can be furnished by this country but also the assistance which can be furnished by other countries in the Western Hemisphere. It is expected that the requirements of the 16 participating countries in the way of imports and credits will be satisfied by other countries in North and South America as well as by the United States. On page 24 of the report, which has been filed by the committee, it is shown that there shall be required imports to the total value of \$12,959,100,000 from the Western Hemisphere.

It is estimated that credits in the sum of \$700,000,000 are expected to be furnished by other countries of the Western Hemisphere. If the credits and commodities are not furnished by our neighbors, either the minimum requirements of the program will not be made available and the program will, to the extent of the failure, be endangered, or we will be asked to make up the deficit, curbing inflationary pressures. The amendment will require that the President take all appropriate methods to secure from the other countries of the Western Hemisphere their necessary assistance and cooperation. There is nothing on the record to show that such steps have thus far been taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has a further amendment, as I understand, which I wish he would submit, to lie upon the table, and to be printed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask be printed and lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill is open to further amendment.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senate apparently having concluded its

work for the day, I now move that a recess be taken until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 11, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 10 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Eve D. Hester, of Indiana, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut.
William L. Kilcoin, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John Dorman, of the District of Columbia.
Raymond E. Lisle, of New York.
William J. Ronan, of New York.

S. Wilson Clark, of California, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

John J. Deviny, of the District of Columbia, to be Public Printer.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be captains

Genevieve S. Beard, WMSM (PT), M2215.
Leona F. Koch, WMSM (Diet.), R884.
Dot Miller, WMSM (Diet.), R2212.
Jessie L. Miller, WSMC (PT), M2111.
Elizabeth M. Nevels, WMSM (Diet.), R2209.
Margaret Stuart, WMSM (Diet.), R537.

To be first lieutenants

Agnes Bacior, ANC, N737362.
Ethel L. Barnes, WMSM (Diet.), R999.
Geraldine B. Bernard, ANC, N753081.
Edith J. Bonnet, ANC, N788513.
Faith Boyd, ANC, N721777.
Faunetta L. Brown, ANC, N727101.
Ann C. Browning, ANC, N762686.
Martha Carle, ANC, N725819.
Corinne Casey, ANC, N764298.
Mary A. Casserly, ANC, N722914.
Katherine E. Chickering, ANC, N720896.
Louise M. Coard, ANC, N742037.
Irene M. Connell, ANC, N757627.
Gladys R. Corey, ANC, N761393.
Dorcas E. Coulter, ANC, N755160.
Edna F. Crandall, ANC, N797540.
Paula B. Crowe, ANC, N727421.
Kathleen M. Dean, ANC, N757103.
Glenice H. Dearborn, ANC, N753327.
Ada W. Desprez, ANC, N767585.
Rachel E. Dilleuth, ANC, N725408.
Irene M. Donahue, ANC, N753537.
Pauline K. Driscoll, ANC, N732846.
Ruby I. Easter, ANC, N763533.
Nellie I. Feagans, ANC, N725433.
Virginia M. Gillespie, ANC, N745399.
Thelma R. Glover, ANC, N788312.
Alyce D. Gordon, ANC, N793629.
Orpha L. Grimsrud, ANC, N773989.
Irene I. Guenther, ANC, N775644.
Corinne R. Hauck, ANC, N755466.
Mildred J. Hillhouse, ANC, N774678.
Marynell A. Hoefs, ANC, N735073.
Betty J. Hughes, ANC, N731300.
Dorothy J. Hund, ANC, N775948.
Jane V. Isler, ANC, N723368.
Oliah Jones, ANC, N795632.

Angie C. Kammeraad, ANC, N731238.
Elizabeth E. King, ANC, N726050.
Julia E. Koszalka, ANC, N724630.
Jean B. Koziol, ANC, N758909.
Rose Kudletz, ANC, N801068.
Ruth R. Kuhlmann, ANC, N775178.
Dorothy E. Kwiatkowski, ANC, N793382.
Mildred D. Lang, ANC, N729246.
Hester M. Logar, ANC, N759736.
Louise M. Malone, ANC, N728197.
Agnes McMahon, ANC, N754840.
Margaret M. McManus, ANC, N760419.
Marian R. McQuiston, ANC, N724987.
Mary A. Michelitch, ANC, N762272.
Irene E. Miller, ANC, N731182.
Ruth T. Mills, ANC, N796495.
Dorothy E. Mooneyham, ANC, N787360.
Dorothy B. Morgan, ANC, N778638.
Mary A. Mulholland, ANC, N769883.
Anne M. Murphy, ANC, N787887.
Gladys M. Nash, ANC, N734451.
Sarah L. Neal, ANC, N787755.
Anne L. Nodziak, ANC, N759749.
Alma M. Nyberg, ANC, N720757.
Ree S. Oler, ANC, N779590.
Mary E. Pilchard, ANC, N728832.
Olivette C. Plante, ANC, N721036.
Ann C. Polchak, ANC, N723095.
Julia R. Pollack, ANC, N755832.
Julianne M. Rheume, ANC, N722736.
Emily M. Rickey, ANC, N762850.
Mabel L. Rime, ANC, N730455.
Ruth M. Robinson, ANC, N730523.
Margaret K. Rucker, ANC, N759826.
Lucile A. Seaman, ANC, N731657.
Eugenia M. Sleva, ANC, N768668.
Carolyn E. Smith, WMSM (Diet.), R1064.
Frances A. Soule, ANC, N797596.
Agatha B. Spaeth, ANC, N779492.
Margaret C. Stafford, ANC, N771471.
Valeska B. Staudt, ANC, N788882.
Annie B. Stewart, ANC, N764389.
Nellie T. Tamalonis, ANC, N796403.
Martha J. Taranta, ANC, N722782.
Lois L. Turnbull, ANC, N732395.
Maude C. Vertrees, ANC, N787411.
M. Eloise Watkins, ANC, N725272.
Marcella Wenderott, ANC, N783472.
Louise A. Whalen, ANC, N759373.
Juanita H. Williams, ANC, N734896.
Eileen A. Wittman, ANC, N758820.
Mary G. Young, ANC, N743936.
Nellie J. Zalesney, ANC, N787775.

To be second lieutenants

Ethlyn S. Altmann, ANC, N793948.
Margaret E. Burk, ANC, N792040.
Odessa A. Falls, ANC, N769510.
Helen J. Fitzgerald, ANC, N792063.
Marilyn A. Goeltz, ANC, N792041.
Alma E. Gulinn, ANC, N792042.
Pearl I. Jank, ANC, N792058.
Phyllis I. Morrow, ANC, N792052.
Della I. Murphy, ANC, N780358.
Nancy B. Power, ANC, N765872.
Katherine W. Schumacher, ANC, N786881.
Jean E. Thompson, ANC, N795665.
Signe Trangsrud, ANC, N797818.
Betty J. Walls, ANC, N778723.
Marian Waterhouse, ANC, N754612.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Charles DeArmond, June 4, 1948.
Robert P. Hilton, June 4, 1948.
Wayne G. Shear, June 4, 1948.

Richard E. Fahrenwald (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

Philip J. McEleney (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

George P. Edgerton (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Glenn E. Drewyer
James P. Moran

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jonathan M. Allen Robert E. Rowand
William L. Chapman Robert W. Sharp, Jr.
Holt B. Maddux Charles R. Sullivan

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

George S. deShazo
William I. Gullett

LIEUTENANTS

Leonard M. Kraske
Jeremiah T. Sunde
Allan L. Wallace

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Luke J. Braxmeyer
Gage Colby
Robert G. Martin

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Eddy L. Harris
Ingrid C. Suess

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Louise J. Bartlett Lillie M. Harwood
Jane H. Farr Gayle M. Lang

ENSIGNS

Ann Belaeff Marita D. Petit
Isabel V. Hunsecker Charlotte S. Rasmussen
Hedwig L. Kratz Louise W. Sharp

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the United States Marine Corps:
John T. Selden

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 10 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

POSTMASTER

J. Willard Krause to be postmaster at Manistee in the State of Michigan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father George E. Shank, of St. Edward's Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, Divine Lawmaker, we implore You to look upon this gathering, invested with the authority of making laws for the welfare of the people of this Nation.

We realize, oh, O God, that any authority given to us comes from You. We beg You to help us always to keep this in mind, especially in this day when Your laws are so disregarded by many, when so many disregard Your very existence. We also realize, O Lord, that unless You build the house, we who build it labor in vain.

The fact that the Members of this Congress for the past century and a half have called upon You for aid has saved our great Nation from many a catastrophe and has made us victorious in many a crisis.

We thank You, good God, for the privilege we enjoy of calling upon You, when in some parts of the world Your name is not allowed to be mentioned. May this privilege always be ours, and may we always, both in public and pri-

vate life, be guided by the teachings which You have laid down for our happiness in this world and eternal happiness in the world to come. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE JAN MASARYK

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Jan Masaryk is dead!

Early reports from the free radio of Europe named the cause of his death as self-destruction—suicide. It could just as easily have been murder. The Kremlin has never stopped at murder. However it was accomplished, it is enough to know that Jan Masaryk, son of Tomas Masaryk and the Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, is dead.

What does Jan Masaryk's death mean to Americans?

It means that the Soviet seizure of power in Czechoslovakia was not a bloodless revolution. It means that one man—irrespective of how he died—shed his blood in protest. It means that the patriotic leaders of Czechoslovakia have not supinely surrendered to Russia in mass. It means that millions of Czechs who love liberty are more closely united than ever to millions of Americans who also love liberty. The United States has had its martyred Lincoln. Czechoslovakia has had its martyred Masaryk.

The Czechoslovakian freedom underground from this day henceforward has a spiritual leader.

From this day forward, there will be no rest for the bestial Soviet conqueror.

We Americans—a few of us who have known and talked to Jan Masaryk, and millions of us who have known him only by his deeds—can say on the day of his death: "Jan Masaryk, yesterday Czechoslovakia was free. Tomorrow, aided by your supreme sacrifice, Czechoslovakia will be free once again."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply regretted to hear the report that Jan Masaryk, Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, was dead, but the spirit of freedom and democracy in Czechoslovakia has not died. It will continue to live until Czechoslovakia frees itself as it has done in the past. The Czech people have never ceased and will not cease now to fight for their freedom.

It was my great privilege to have known the father of Jan Masaryk, Tomas G. Masaryk, who became the first President of Czechoslovakia, and who was recognized, as was our own George Washington, as the Father of His Country. The Masaryk family was a democratic family, believing in democracy and in freedom for its people.

Mr. Speaker, I recollect when Professor Masaryk visited Washington, and it was my privilege early in 1918, during the First World War, to arrange a meeting with President Wilson, at which time he conveyed to the President the aspirations and determinations of the Czech people. It was thought by some persons that it might be well to have a separate peace with Austria-Hungary, but the President, after listening to us, came to the conclusion that it would be unwise and the Allies could not gain anything thereby, and the smaller nations, which had been dominated by the Hapsburgs of Austria-Hungary, would be deprived of an opportunity of self-determination. I was pleased, shortly thereafter, when President Wilson addressed the Congress, calling off the negotiations for a separate peace with Austria-Hungary, and a little later conditions developed in these smaller nations which I had predicted would occur that brought about the overthrow of the Austro-Hungarian Government. Most of these smaller countries thereby succeeded, with our aid, to obtain the freedom and liberty which they had dreamed of, hoped and prayed for, for many years.

Prof. Tomas G. Masaryk, as I have stated, became the first President of that liberty- and freedom-loving newborn Czechoslovakia, and under his leadership it adopted a constitution patterned after our own. Within a few years the country prospered under his guidance and was recognized as the most stable, progressive republic in Europe. Upon the death of President Masaryk, he was succeeded by Eduard Benes, his coworker in the early days of liberation and in the upbuilding of Czechoslovakia after it had attained its independence.

Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the sacrifice of Czechoslovakia on the altar of appeasement. Notwithstanding that misfortune, it never ceased, under the leadership of President Benes and Jan Masaryk in exile, to strive to again attain its independence, freedom, and liberty. When the Nazi hordes swarmed over its borders to be later driven out by the Russians, these patriots returned and again resumed the reins of administration of their Government. Czechoslovakia again started to rebuild and reconstruct and to enjoy the freedom and liberty of which they had been deprived by the Nazis. Appointed as Foreign Minister, Jan Masaryk strove with all his might in cooperating with President Benes in effecting a real democratic form of government. It was his further aim and ambition that Czechoslovakia should lead the way and strive to bring about an understanding between the nations of western and eastern Europe. He actually and honestly believed that any danger of war could be avoided, but when, unfortunately, the Communists seized control of the country, Masaryk, in the interest of peace and to prevent bloodshed, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, continued to hold the post of Foreign Minister. He was quoted as saying he was doing so, having in view the best interests of his country.

Mr. Speaker, I knew the Masaryk family for many years and Jan Masaryk from the beginning of the First World War.

He, like his father, was a sincere believer in a democratic form of government and, like his people, believed in freedom and liberty. When the story of his death is revealed, it will be found that he could not endure seeing his country in the grasp of Communists. Jan Masaryk lived for his country and gave up his life for its freedom. I hope to God that his death will not in any way affect the aspirations and the determination of the freedom-loving Czechs, the Slovaks, and the peoples everywhere who are deprived of their freedom, liberty, and the right to a democratic form of government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an editorial by John Knight entitled "United States Foreign Policy Stumbles Toward War."

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* in two instances and include in each extraneous matter.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as the world watches fearfully the encroachments of aggressive militarism, and when the hope of 12,000,000 men and women who entered the armed forces during the late war was a hope that this phase of human activity might forever be brought to an end, I take the floor only to call to the attention of the House a letter I received in the mail this morning. It is one of the most thoughtful and thought-provoking communications it has been my privilege to receive since I have been here. It is a letter from one of our American soldiers in Germany written to his mother and father in this country. They, in turn, forwarded it to me. I am taking time this morning to call it to the attention of the Members because without reference to my personal beliefs so far as adequate national defense is concerned, I think that this letter phrases better than any words which I might conjure up the feeling of our men abroad today with respect to the inadequate measures which are being taken to strengthen our national defense. The letter reads as follows:

JULY 4, 1947.

DEAREST MOM AND DAD: I guess it's time I write you again. Seeing as today is a holiday, but not for me, I thought I'd better write. I'm riding a troop train right now, so if my writing is a bit irregular, don't worry. Business is about the same as usual for me, nothing much doing. Riding trains all the time gets mighty monotonous.

It sure does grieve me to think that there are mothers and other people in the United States who are against universal military training. The next time you see some of those women, Mom, you tell them this for me, and I only wish I could be there myself to tell them. The next time we have a scrap on our hands it will be down upon us before

we know it. Instead of 2 or 3 years to raise an army we'll have 2 or 3 days, maybe less. We won't have to worry about sending an army overseas, we'll be digging our fox holes right in our front yards and setting up machine guns in the ruins of our houses. Everyone will have to be trained to resist an enemy on the spot. The days of the minute man and the muzzle loader have passed a hundred years ago. If they think that when fighting starts they can pick up a rifle and call themselves soldiers they are sadly mistaken. We fight nowadays with precision built, intricate murderous weapons whose technique can only be mastered after months of back-breaking and brain-racking drill. An incompetent, partly or untrained soldier is worse than none at all. He is what makes our casualty rate so high. And don't think we didn't send thousands of them to be slaughtered in this last war. The cemeteries are full of them because half of them did not know how to load or fire a rifle. They were murdered by these so-called pacifists. If these people are too stupid and selfish to dedicate a year's service to their country, and feel that our freedom and future as Americans is worth defending only with someone else's blood, then they are not Americans and we have no room for them. They are the lowest form of humanity, the kind that have no qualms about enjoying the priceless privileges of our country, but are too yellow to fulfill their responsibility and obligation in defending it. Maybe they will remember, and feel just a little sorry when they see their sons and my buddies splattered all over the landscape because they were denied a year's training that might have saved their lives. Probably not, they don't seem to be the type of people that have warm red blood in their veins.

As for this talk about atom bombs making the infantry obsolete, I hear that the guy who invented the bow and arrow thought that he had made infantry obsolete too, but we're still here. Right now it is our duty as peacetime soldiers to shake some sense into a country honeycombed with fair-weather citizens. And you can tell them this for me, too, that I wouldn't swap my 3 years' service for 3 years in anybody's college. These last 3 years have been the greatest experience of my life. I didn't know the meaning of democracy, or just who and what an American was before I joined. I have had lessons taught me that no school can offer. However, I have come to appreciate the need and meaning of a good education as have the majority of servicemen. And don't let anyone tell you that returning servicemen aren't better citizens and scholars, as a rule, than nonservicemen.

Maybe I have harped too much, but it hurts me sorely everytime I think of those selfish, self-centered individuals who put their own personal wants and needs above the wants and needs of 130,000,000 neighbors. They are willfully violating every basic precept of democracy. They would have our Government answer to a minority. I consider them a worse threat than communism because they would enable a communistic conquest of our country to be a pushover. Maybe this sounds like a bitter tirade, but I am not bitter, only stupefied by the fact that we tolerate such harmful thinking in our country. Just tell them that for me, Mom, will you? I guess this outburst must have come rather unexpectedly, but it has been accumulating in me for a long time. I guess it's better that I flip my cork to you instead of going out and cracking a few skulls together, which I would dearly love to do.

THE LATE JAN MASARYK

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my husband and I had the great privilege of knowing Ambassador Jan Masaryk since World War I days. He knew the United States very well. He had come to learn about us and our freedom, as his father did, and he seemed to us almost like an American, and a fine American. He had a wide interest and knowledge of international affairs. He was a great diplomat, a great statesman, and a great patriot. I remember his interest in the disabled American soldiers in our hospitals here, and during the time of his stay in Washington he used to send red roses to me to give to the veterans. That shows his kindness, his thoughtfulness, and his love for America. A great man has gone to his reward.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* in reference to the late Clarence Hancock, former Member of the House, and further to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the *Times-Herald* of Washington.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a report to the Congress of the United States concerning a court house for the District of Columbia.

Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD*.

Mr. LOVE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an address he delivered before the West Virginia Petroleum Association on the subject, *A Reflection of Our Foreign Policies*.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* in two instances.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an editorial.

Mr. McCONNELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a letter from a constituent on the subject, *Are High Taxes Deflationary?*

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include an article.

SAMUEL GEARHART

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform the Members of Congress and the American people of a shocking incident which has been given practically no attention whatsoever to this date. This incident, gentlemen, I feel should provoke thinking

on the part of Congress and the American people, particularly as to the final disposition of justice. I refer to a young man, a member of our armed services, by the name of Samuel Gearhart, of the city of Allentown, Pa.

Samuel Gearhart, according to the records, was the youngest marine to go ashore in the attack of Guadalcanal. He was discharged from the United States Marine Corps in 1945 and then joined the Army occupation forces in Europe the following year.

On December 19, 1947, this American soldier was kicked and beaten to death by a Russian newspaper correspondent by the name of Stepan Inrin in the city of Vienna, Austria. Private Gearhart, according to the record of the War Department, became engaged in a brawl with the Russian correspondent and the fact as to who struck the first blow, according to conflicting testimony, has not been established. However, the records reveal that Private Gearhart was fatally injured in Vienna's international sector on December 19. A spokesman for the United States Army provost marshal's office described Private Gearhart's death as a plain case of murder. He was not only struck a felling blow but the autopsy, according to the record of the War Department, reveals that he died approximately 13 hours after the blow was struck from cerebral hemorrhages and that there were heel marks and other marks showing that some sort of an instrument had been used to batter the head of Private Gearhart.

My friends, this is the worst type of brutality that one can conceive. Many people in my district, since the story first appeared in our local paper, have been inquiring as to the follow through of the Army or State Department, or whoever might be responsible as to the disposition of this case, and if there is any justice to be sought in what the Army provost marshal's office termed "a plain case of murder."

At the time of the incident, a spokesman for the United States Army said, according to the newspaper articles, there was no doubt the Army would advise the Russians that Inrin should be charged with murder. However, 3 months later it is found there has been no report as to the disposition of this case nor any further facts concerning the case since the original report which I have briefly outlined was made in December of last year. At that time the United States Army investigator reported their probe was still in a preliminary stage, and, gentlemen, it seems that it has never moved from the preliminary stage. Private Gearhart was never able to give his version. He died without regaining consciousness.

This story is magnified by a very recent occurrence in Vienna. In fact, last Sunday, March 7, according to United States Army authorities, an American soldier was shot in the back after refusing a Russian order to get off the street and into the gutter in front of a Russian headquarters hotel in the international district of Vienna. The provost marshal's office has stated the soldier will probably lose his left arm. Yes, Pvt. Jack Grunden, of Portland, Oreg., while walking with two other American soldiers

and three Austrian girls was struck and knocked to his knees by a rifle butt, and, while still on the ground, the Russian sentry fired a shot into his back. Another shot entered the soldier's arm, smashing the elbow. The American soldiers were unarmed, the story reveals, according to American Army regulations. We are told the American officials were irate over the fact the Russians acted with no regard for the international patrol, supposedly the sole authority in such cases. They described this as the "boldest act yet perpetrated against a member of the occupation forces in Vienna by a Russian soldier." This statement, ladies and gentlemen, was carried in a release dated March 8, 1948. Yet 3 months ago a similar bold act cost the life of Pvt. Samuel Gearhart.

In questioning the War Department I was informed that if my office and certain members of the press had not started prodding and questioning the War Department on its position or action in this case, it would have become a forgotten incident. By making inquiries to the War Department, they were prodded to inquire for additional information from General Keyes, stationed in Vienna, which is still forthcoming.

Members of Congress, I feel that this incident should not go unnoticed, and I feel the proper authorities in our Government should do everything possible to see that those who have committed crimes against our American soldiers are brought to justice. If this cannot be done, then I certainly feel that the people of my district and the American people generally should know that there has been a refusal on the part of the authorities charged with the handling of matters of this kind by the Russian Government, and I do feel that there should be greater interest shown in incidents of this kind, which certainly do not seem to be rare, for within a period of a few months in the same area it is found that demonstrations of violence have occurred against our American soldiers, and that either the War Department or the State Department should decide whose responsibility it is to give to Congress and the American people the complete story and what disposition has been made in cases of this kind.

I would like to insert in the RECORD an article on the first incident referred to, that of Pvt. Samuel Gearhart, which appeared in the Allentown Chronicle and News and was written by Harkey Reiter, which illustrates a policy that might well be adhered to today:

Sam Gearhart, of Allentown, probably never heard of two persons named Perdicaris and Raisuli when he was the youngest American marine to go ashore in the attack on Guadalcanal.

Probably he still had never heard of Perdicaris and Raisuli when he escorted his girl into the lobby of the Lugueck Hotel in Vienna, Austria, just 1 week before last Christmas. He did not have much time to study history during his busy years with the marines, ending in 1945. He had less time for history when he joined the Army occupation forces in Europe the next year.

Out of nowhere, according to the best information that can be secured, came a big and husky Russian newspaper correspondent who took offense at something and knocked the American down. As the little American

soldier lay on the hotel floor—he was only 5 feet 3 inches—the Russian, Stepan Inrin, 23, kicked and kicked until Gearhart's face was a bloody pulp. Then the Russian ground his heel into the boy's head. Two other American soldiers who came to Gearhart's rescue were terribly beaten and bitten before a police patrol subdued the killer.

Gearhart never regained consciousness to tell his side of the story. The United States Army provost marshal described Gearhart's death as "a plain case of murder" and turned Inrin over to the Russians for trial.

The story might end there, but nobody in Washington seems to know or care what has happened to Gearhart's murderer. Days of calling on the War Department for information met with rebuff and indifference until this week when finally a cable was sent by the General Staff of the Army asking for a report. The State Department says this is an Army matter and none of their concern.

That's where Perdicaris and Raisuli came in.

Not so many years ago, when Teddy Roosevelt was President of the United States, a Greek-born American citizen was captured by a Moroccan bandit named Raisuli and held for ransom. Our Government heard about it and swung into action without prompting or hesitation.

"Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead," was the sharp word sent by our Secretary of State to the Sultan of Morocco. Perdicaris was released. As far as most of us know in Washington, both Perdicaris and Raisuli may still be alive.

But little Gearhart, the youngest marine to go ashore at Guadalcanal, is dead—murdered in revolting fashion. No message went forward about him from our Government until 2 months had passed and people back in Allentown began to ask questions, wondering if the Russian had been tried, found guilty, and punished.

Now the cable asks our Army leaders what has happened. The American Government, or any part of it, has yet to ask Russia if Inrin has been punished; and if not, why not. We've changed a lot since Teddy Roosevelt's day.

THE LATE JAN MASARYK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join the others of my colleagues who have today spoken in sympathy on the death of Jan Masaryk. I was in Prague with a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs only last summer. I know what an active and bright city it was and how far it had gone in recovery. I heard on every side of the great contribution Jan Masaryk had made to that recovery. I join with my colleagues in saying that freedom is indeed dying in Czechoslovakia with this untimely passing of Jan Masaryk.

THE SUICIDE OF JAN MASARYK

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, among the more significant bits of recent Moscow broadcasts was one made last Sunday for Soviet Home

Service entitled "The United States Future Belongs to the Third Party." A third party for the United States is the Moscow line. On March 3 I inserted in the Record the June 1947 article of Moscow Agent Bittleman that appeared in the Communist magazine Political Affairs, showing the plan for a third party in the United States for the Muscovites.

The Soviet radio fills the air of Europe these days, and another choice bit of broadcasting is the staged speech of Jan Masaryk, Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia last Friday. Masaryk is one of the few non-Communists in the new Czechoslovakian Government. According to the Soviet propaganda, Masaryk said last Friday:

Our solution lies in our alliance with the Soviet Union and our place is by its side. We must be grateful if they allow us to occupy this place. When I hear of people who started the resistance, I felt a stab at my heart. Resistance against Hitler, yes; but resistance against one's own blood, own brothers, and own republic, never. I am convinced—

Concluded Masaryk—
that I will not live to see war.

Gentlemen, probably Masaryk did say, as the Soviet radio quotes him as saying, that he would not live to see a war of resistance by true Czechs against the Soviet Government in Czechoslovakia.

But, gentlemen, Jan Masaryk this morning jumped to his death from the office of the Foreign Ministry. This was probably through some kind of motives of patriotism or because of the complete loss of liberty in that land where his father is known as the liberator. Perhaps he meant it as a signal for the people of Czechoslovakia to rise up against the garrotting government of Gottwald. Regardless of precise motives, the act of Masaryk gives the lie to the siren voice of the Soviet radio that hums over Europe.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 144) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use not to exceed 5,000 additional copies each of the report and appendix of the special Mundt subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs covering an investigation during September and October 1947 of the United States Information Service in Europe and the conditions affecting it, pursuant to provisions of House Resolution 295.

—With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the words "for its use."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 143) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings relative to Reduction of Individual Income Taxes, held before said committee during the current session.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "one thousand" and insert "fifteen hundred" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVENUE REVISIONS, 1947-48

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 142) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies each of parts 4 and 5 of the hearings relative to revenue revisions, 1947-48, held before said committee during the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, in one to include the lead article in this morning's Washington Post.

THE LATE JAN MASARYK

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned only a moment ago from the remarks of our

colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], of the untimely passing of that charming gentleman, able statesman, great friend of the United States, and world citizen, Jan Masaryk. Those of you who knew him understand my reference to the fact that he had as fine a personality and brain as anyone we know and that he was as great an asset to our country as we had outside of this country.

I did not get to read the papers. I understand from the remarks of the last gentleman who referred to it that he jumped out of a window. I am not so sure about that. He may have jumped out of a window but I do not believe it. But however he may have met his end, not only that unfortunate little country of Czechoslovakia, which finds itself under the conqueror's heel for the second time in a decade, but the United States and the world have lost a great friend and an able and excellent citizen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Star of March 6, entitled "Racial Riders."

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a very interesting article.

Mr. WHEELER asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three instances, in two of which to include articles.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

THE LATE JAN MASARYK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Jan Masaryk brings directly and forcefully to our minds the tragedy of Czechoslovakia. As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] well said, 1,000,000 Americans of Czechoslovakian blood mourn that tragedy. I want to amplify that by saying that all Americans, without regard to our racial origin, outside of the Communists in our midst, mourn the tragedy of Czechoslovakia; also the tragedy of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, Hungary, China, and the efforts being made in Austria and the battleground that exists now in the elections carried on in Italy. The entire world looks to America to use our powers affirmatively and effectively to meet this vicious challenge. Out of the tragedy of Czechoslovakia and the tragedy of the other countries and other places I hope America will learn the lesson of affirmative

action and effective action to preserve the western civilization, to preserve decent civilizations where people want to exist under their own form of government, freely arrived at, and where they want to possess the dignity and personality of an individual. Early and immediate action affirmatively and effectively taken by our country is the only answer to the vicious challenge of atheistic communism.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit today during the session of the House during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include therewith a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Waukegan, Ill., 13 printers employed by the Waukegan News-Sun resigned from the AFL-International Typographical Union, saying:

We object to the policy of the officers of the International Typographical Union in their refusal to obey the laws of our Nation.

We will not contribute to any funds to be used to destroy our country's laws.

We are American citizens first.

This is the expression of 13 loyal, patriotic, heretofore union members of my congressional district. I am proud of their action and commend them for setting an example for other loyal workers of our Nation facing the same problem during these troublesome times. They refuse to be used to destroy our country's laws.

WAUKEGAN PRINTERS QUIT ITU PROTESTING UNION HEADS' POLICY

WAUKEGAN, ILL., March 9.—Thirteen of 20 printers employed by the Waukegan News-Sun, a daily newspaper, resigned today from the AFL-International Typographical Union in protest against the ITU's employer-relations policy.

In a letter to R. A. Hawks, president of the ITU's Waukegan Local 294, the resigning members said: "We object to the policy of the officers of the International Typographical Union in their refusal to obey the laws of our Nation."

ITU NOTICE REJECTED

The resignations followed notice by the ITU executive council of a special 4½ percent strike assessment of union members' wages to support printers on strike against newspapers in Chicago and some other cities.

"The union dues the past year have been in excess of 2½ percent of our gross earnings," the letter of resignation said. "Now, these dues have been increased in excess of 7 percent in order to supply funds to fight the United States Government.

"We will not contribute to any funds to be used to destroy our country's laws.

"We are American citizens first."

The 13 printers notified F. Ward Just, general manager of the newspaper, that "the union no longer represents us for the purpose of collective bargaining or in any other capacity."

Most of the printers have been members of local 294 for 1 year. The union's contract with the News-Sun expired March 4 this year. No contract to supplant that which expired has been negotiated.

WAR CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to give the General Accounting Office authority before or after final settlement to examine any records maintained by any contracting agency or by any war contractor relating to any termination settlement and giving authority to the Comptroller General to investigate the settlement methods and procedures employed.

I have been disturbed by reports recently made to the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments by the Comptroller General that favoritism and possibly fraud has been used in many instances in the settlement of war contracts. I was disturbed the first time I heard the description of the workings of the war contract settlements of 1944 by one person who was employed under it, and what has happened since has not reduced that feeling of disturbance in my mind. I fear that the thing we sought to do with the renegotiation statute to curb excessive war profits in the making of contracts of procurement may have been abandoned in the operation of the settlement of war contracts in the post-war period. I feel therefore that the Comptroller General should have this authority to go into the situation fully and report the facts to Congress for appropriate action.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow following the business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and include extraneous matter.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 22]

Abbott	Hartley	Norton
Allen, Ill.	Hays	Owens
Andrew, N. Y.	Herter	Patman
Barden	Hill	Patterson
Battle	Hinschaw	Pfeifer
Bell	Jenkins, Ohio	Phillips, Calif.
Bloom	Jensen	Rains
Bonner	Jones, N. C.	Rooney
Buckley	Kean	Sadlack
Byrne, N. Y.	Kee	Sarbacher
Chapfield	Kefauver	Scott
Clark	Kennedy	Hugh D., Jr.
Clippinger	Kerr	Shafer
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Short
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski	Stratton
Delaney	Lodge	Sundstrom
Dingell	Ludlow	Teague
Domenegeaux	McCowan	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	McMahon	Vursell
Foot	Manasco	West
Gross	Morrow	Wilson, Ind.
Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.	Wood
Hall	Mitchell	
Edwin Arthur Morrison		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 358 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House and offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves to strike from the RECORD the speech of Representative ADOLPH SABATH, beginning on page 2483 and ending on page 2487 of the daily RECORD, together with the insertions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the most vicious attacks I have ever known were made on the Committee on Un-American Activities—a committee composed of Democrats and Republicans, who are doing the best they can to protect this country against enemies within our gates.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], in addition to his own remarks, inserted in the RECORD several vicious documents, one of which said that the committee continues the "practice of Hitler and Himmler, which would lead America, as it did Germany, down the road to fascism."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No; not now.

Another one, and perhaps the most inexcusable, is an article he inserted, written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, in which she accused the committee of subversive activities or activities that amount to subversion.

In that statement she said:

It seems to me that the current proceedings of the House Un-American Activities

Committee as directed against Dr. Edward U. Condon, instead of giving people confidence that the committee is really trying to destroy Communist influence, is doing just the opposite.

Further down, she said, in speaking of Dr. Condon—and I want every Member to listen to this, because I am going to turn the sunlight of pitiless publicity on Dr. Condon as I go along.

She said:

He belongs, as many American scientists do, to the American-Soviet Society.

Then she says:

I am afraid this attack on Dr. Condon has given good material to those who, for their own reasons, wish to discredit any attack on real Communist activities carried on under cover. It is, therefore, unwise, unjust, and really subversive in its effect.

Mr. Speaker, sticking that stuff into the Record not only violates the rules of the House but it violates all the rules of propriety and all the rules of common decency.

Now, let us take up what she calls the American-Soviet Society, to which Dr. Condon belongs.

Remember now, the Committee on Un-American Activities did not start this investigation of Dr. Condon. It was going on for months and months before it was called to our attention. There is a letter on Dr. Condon in the files of the Department of Commerce, about three pages in length, written by J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, which they refused to let the Committee on Un-American Activities or any other committee of Congress see. Let us see what was going on.

I have before me a photostatic copy of a letter, the heading of which is "Soviet-American Science Society." That is the society Mrs. Roosevelt talks about, "Affiliated"—now, listen to this—"Affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc."

They use the same office, 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York 16, N. Y., and the same telephone which is Murray Hill 3-2082.

Now, let me read you this letter, and then I want to show you Dr. Condon's connection with it; and do not forget the atomic bomb that means more to the safety of America than any other instrument ever invented by the genius of man is involved in this fight.

On March 7, 1946, Samuel Gelfan wrote a letter to various members, various people who are connected with the Department of Commerce. We struck out the name and had this photostatic copy made for the record. Let me read it to you, together with the names of the officers and members of the executive committee, which you will see Dr. Condon heads:

The letter reads as follows:

AMERICAN-SOVIET SCIENCE SOCIETY

(Affiliated with National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York 16, N. Y., Murray Hill 3-2082)

MARCH 7, 1946.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS,
United States Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR —: It has been suggested by Dr. Condon, who is a member of our executive

committee, that you might be interested in the activities of our society and membership in same.

We are, therefore, enclosing a brief statement concerning the objectives and activity of our organization, and under separate cover are also mailing you a copy of our last bulletin.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL GELFAN,

For the Membership Committee.

Chairman, L. C. Dunn; honorary chairmen, Walter B. Cannon, Gilbert N. Lewis; honorary vice chairmen, Alice Hamilton, Irving Langmuir, Chauncey D. Leake, Leo Loeb, Wilden Penfield, Florence R. Sabin, C. E. A. Winslow; executive committee, Edward U. Condon, M. Demerec, Th. Dobzhansky, Carl O. Dunbar, John E. Flynn, Samuel Gelfan, Harry Grundfest, Michael Heidelberger, S. Lefschetz, D. A. Maccines, A. E. Mirsky, Marston Morse, Stuart Mudd, Mervin E. Oakes, Th. Shedlovsky, W. M. Stanley, Selman A. Waksman, Philip R. White, Ignace Zlotowski, Vladimir K. Zworykin; Edwin S. Smith, executive director, National Council American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.

The word "bulletin" is underscored.

Sincerely yours, Samuel Gelfan, for the membership committee.

I call your attention to the fact that the man who heads the executive committee of the organization is Edward U. Condon.

Now, remember, this is the American-Soviet Science Society that is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.

I submit that whenever the Department of Justice wakes up and points out a subversive organization and brands it as subversive there should be no doubt about it. On December 4, 1947, just about 2 months before this issue broke, the Attorney General, for the Department of Justice, wrote a letter addressed to Hon. Seth W. Richardson, Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board, Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C. In this letter he included a long list of subversive organizations, and one of them that he included as being subversive was the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, the very organization this American-Soviet Science Society is affiliated with, according to their own letterhead, which I have just read to you. They use the same office in New York, they use the same telephone.

The Attorney General's letter reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., November 24, 1947.

HON. SETH W. RICHARDSON,

Chairman, Loyalty Review Board,
Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RICHARDSON: This is submitted pursuant to the President's Executive Order No. 9835, in which he stated that it is of vital importance that persons employed in the Federal service be of complete and unswerving loyalty to the United States, and further stated that although the loyalty of by far the overwhelming majority of all Government employees is beyond question, the presence within the Government service of any disloyal or subversive person constitutes a threat to our democratic processes. The order provided in part III, section 3, as follows:

"3. The Loyalty Review Board shall currently be furnished by the Department of Justice the name of each foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons which the Attorney General, after appropriate investigation

and determination, designates as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

"a. The Loyalty Review Board shall disseminate such information to all departments and agencies."

Under a previous Executive order (No. 9300), issued February 5, 1943, entitled "Establishing the Interdepartmental Committee to Consider Cases of Subversive Activity on the Part of Federal Employees," and under other relevant authority, the Department of Justice named a number of organizations as subversive. That list was disseminated among the Government agencies for use in connection with consideration of employee loyalty, and included the following organizations:

American League Against War and Fascism.
American Patriots, Inc.
American Peace Mobilization.
American Youth Congress.
Association of German Nationals (Reichs-deutsche Vereinigung).
Black Dragon Society.
Central Japanese Association (Beikoku Chuo Nipponjin Kai).
Central Japanese Association of Southern California.
The Central Organization of the German-American National Alliance (Deutsche-Amerikanische Einheitsfront).
Communist Party of U. S. A.
Congress of American Revolutionary Writers.
Dai Nippon Butoku Kai (Military Virtue Society of Japan or Military Art Society of Japan).
Dante Alighieri Society.
Federation of Italian War Veterans in the U. S. A., Inc. (Associazione Nazionale Combattenti Italiani, Federazione degli Stati Uniti d'America).
Friends of the New Germany (Freunde des Neuen Deutschlands).
German-American Bund (Amerikadeutscher Volksbund).
German-American Vocational League (Deutsche-Amerikanische Berufsgemeinschaft).
Heimusha Kai, also known as Nokubei Heiki Gimusha Kai, Zaihei Nihonjin, Heiyaku Gimusha Kai, and Zaihei Heimusha Kai (Japanese Residing in America Military Conscripts Association).
Hinode Kai (Imperial Japanese reservists).
Hinomaru Kai (Rising Sun Flag Society, a group of Japanese war veterans).
Hokubei Zaigo Shoke Dan (North American Reserve Officers Association).
Japanese Association of America.
Japanese Overseas Central Society (Kaigai Dobo Chuo Kai).
Japanese Overseas Convention, Tokyo, Japan, 1940.
Japanese Protective Association (recruiting organization).
Jikyoku lin Kai (Current Affairs Association).
Kibel Seinen Kai (association of United States citizens of Japanese ancestry who have returned to America after studying in Japan).
Kyffhaeuser, also known as Kyffhaeuser League (Kyffhaeuser Bund), Kyffhaeuser Fellowship (Kyffhaeuser Kameradschaft).
Kyffhaeuser War Relief (Kyffhaeuser Kriegshilfswerk).
Lictor Society (Italian black shirts).
Mario Morgantini Circle.
Michigan Federation for Constitutional Liberties.
Nanka Teikoku Gunyudan (imperial military friends group or southern California war veterans).

National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.

National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

National Negro Congress.

Nichiei Kogyo Kaisha (the Great Fujii Theatre).

Northwest Japanese Association.

Protestant War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

Sakura Kai (Patriotic Society, or Cherry Association—composed of veterans of Russo-Japanese War).

Shinto Temples.

Silver Shirt Legion of America.

Sokoku Kai (Fatherland Society).

Sulko Sha (Reserve Officers Association, Los Angeles).

Washington Book Shop Association.

Washington Committee for Democratic Action.

Workers Alliance.

Under part III, section 3, of Executive Order No. 9835, the following additional organizations are hereby designated:

American Polish Labor Council.

American Youth for Democracy.

Armenian Progressive League of America.

Civil Rights Congress and its affiliated organizations, including: Civil Rights Congress for Texas, Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York, The Columbians.

Communist Party, United States of America, formerly Communist Political Association, and its affiliates and committees, including: Citizens Committee of the Upper West Side (New York City); Committee To Aid the Fighting South; Dennis Defense Committee; Labor Research Association, Inc.; Southern Negro Youth Congress; United May Day Committee; United Negro and Allied Veterans of America.

Connecticut State Youth Conference.

Council on African Affairs.

Hollywood Writers Mobilization for Defense.

Hungarian-American Council for Democracy.

International Workers Order, including People's Radio Foundation, Inc.

Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Ku Klux Klan.

Macedonian-American People's League.

National Committee To Win the Peace.

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Nature Friends of America (since 1935).

New Committee for Publications.

Photo League (New York City).

Proletarian Party of America.

Revolutionary Workers League.

Socialist Workers Party, including American Committee for European Workers' Relief.

Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. Workers Party, including Socialist Youth League.

Your attention is also directed to certain organizations which are operated as schools. While, of course, I am not of the view that any institution of learning, devoted to the advancement of knowledge, is subversive, it appears that these organizations are adjuncts of the Community Party. They are as follows:

Abraham Lincoln School, Chicago, Ill.

George Washington Carver School, New York City.

Jefferson School of Social Science New York City.

Ohio School of Social Sciences.

Philadelphia School of Social Science and Art.

Samuel Adams School, Boston, Mass.

School of Jewish Studies, New York City.

Seattle Labor School, Seattle, Wash.

Tom Paine School of Social Science, Philadelphia, Pa.

Tom Paine School of Westchester, N. Y.

Walt Whitman School of Social Science, Newark, N. J.

After the issuance of Executive Order 9835 by the President, the Department compiled all available data with respect to the type of organization to be dealt with under that order. The investigative reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning such organizations were correlated. Memoranda on each such organization were prepared by attorneys of the Department. The list of organizations herein certified is based on their recommendations as reviewed by the Solicitor General, the Assistant Attorneys General, and the Assistant Solicitor General, and my subsequent careful study of the recommendations of all.

In connection with the designation of these organizations I wish to reiterate, as the President has pointed out, that it is entirely possible that many persons belonging to such organizations may be loyal to the United States; that membership in, affiliation with, or sympathetic association with, any organization designated, is simply one piece of evidence which may or may not be helpful in arriving at a conclusion as to the action which is to be taken in a particular case. "Guilt by association" has never been one of the principles of our American jurisprudence. We must be satisfied that reasonable grounds exist for concluding that an individual is disloyal. That must be the guide.

The organizations named in this letter do not represent a complete or final compilation. For example, a number of small and local organizations are not listed. As to many organizations not named, the presently available information is insufficient to warrant a final determination as to their character. Others, presently innocuous, may become the victims of dangerous infiltrating forces and, as a consequence, become proper subjects for designation. New organizations may come into existence whose purposes and activities are in conflict with loyalty to the United States.

From time to time, therefore, as contemplated and directed by the Executive order, there will be furnished to the Board the names of those additional organizations and groups as to which the information received by this Department, resulting from continued investigation, indicates similar designations are required.

If I can be of further assistance to you in reference to the subject matter of this letter, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

You dig into it and you will find that this National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was involved 2 years ago, about the time this letter was written, when the Committee on Un-American Activities was turning heaven and earth in its efforts to catch the Soviet spies who were in this country trying to steal the secrets of the atomic bomb.

A Member said on the floor yesterday, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI], that Members who amounted to anything would not even go on this Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is right. That is what I said.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and there is not a word of truth in that statement. Everybody knows there is not a word of truth in it, that is, everybody knows that except the Member from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Now, the Polish Embassy has been brought up. Everybody knows that Poland has been taken over by the Communists, and that the Polish Embassy down here is a Soviet Embassy.

That is the kind of attacks that are waged against such men as Chairman PARNELL THOMAS, who has almost given his life in this fight. They have attacked Martin Dies in a manner they would not have dared intimated if Dies had been a Member of the House.

Then there is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT], and your humble servant.

Do you think those Members get any pleasure out of going through all this fight and taking all this abuse? No. We are doing it in order to protect our country for which our boys fought and died on the battlefields of the last war.

Now, I resent Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's attack on this committee.

In my honest opinion, she has done more harm than any other woman who lived since Cleopatra; she has done more to stir up race trouble in the South and has done the Negroes more harm than any other woman who ever lived.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time the American Congress exercises its constitutional powers. If these bureaucrats continue to refuse to furnish the Congress that letter, I submit the Congress ought to send for it and get it. If this man has been mixed up with that kind of an outfit, as the letterhead over his own name, with his own name printed on it, indicates, he should not be head of the Bureau of Standards, or even connected with it.

Mr. Speaker, this is my country, and it comes ahead of every other consideration.

It is much more pleasant for me to go out into the cloakroom and sit around and criticize, as some other Members do. But this country is in danger, and it is our duty to protect it.

One Member got up here on yesterday and accused the police of Mississippi of lynching Negroes. There never was a baser falsehood.

What was that done for?

It was done to try to stir up race prejudice against the white people of the southern States, who have done more for the Negroes than any other people who ever lived in all the tide of time.

If they will let us alone we will get along with the Negroes in the South—as we have done throughout the years.

Why all these attacks?

They are trying to discredit and destroy the one committee of Congress that has the power of investigation, a committee that has gone the full length in trying to protect this country against these enemies within our gates.

I pointed out to you on yesterday that if that gang had their way and could get their hands on a sufficient number of atomic bombs they could plant one in each of the chief cities of America, with time fuses, and paralyze the country in one night; burn to a crisp, you might say, not only everything in Washington, New York, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, Baltimore, Atlanta, and New Orleans, but every other city in America.

I am suspicious of anybody who attempts to keep us from getting the information that letter contains. If it is a clean bill of health, let us see it. Let Dr. Condon explain why he belongs to an organization that was affiliated with a Communist front, using the same office, and the same telephone.

I am making this statement, and I am making this motion, to strike that stuff from the RECORD for the simple reason that I am unwilling to sit here and hear these attacks made upon a committee of the House that gets nothing but abuse from our enemies, and sometimes fails to get the proper support from our friends.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not a fact that Dr. Condon has repeatedly requested to appear before the committee, and up to now the committee has not given him an opportunity to appear and defend himself?

Mr. RANKIN. Whenever Dr. Condon will bring that letter from the FBI, we will be glad to receive him.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That letter is not in his possession.

Mr. RANKIN. That is all right; it is in the possession of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But he has asked to appear.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, whenever he wants to come and the Department is willing to bring that letter he may do so. But we want all the facts.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but only for a question.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has not found anything in my speech that I said in favor of Condon. I stated on the floor that I did not know the gentleman, but that I felt he should be entitled to fair treatment. Now—

Mr. RANKIN. I decline to yield further. I have heard all that.

Mr. SABATH. Is that not so?

Mr. RANKIN. I decline to yield further, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SABATH. One question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has the floor, and he has declined to yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman objects to the articles that I inserted that have been printed in the RECORD. Is that what he objects to?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have already stated before that I object to his putting in the RECORD those false and vicious attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities. I do not care who wrote them. He had no right to put them in the RECORD.

I have moved that they be stricken from the RECORD, and on that, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In the event the previous question is adopted—

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been adopted.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Has the previous question been adopted?

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been adopted. The Chair stated, "Without objection, the previous question is ordered," and then put the question on the motion.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In other words, then, the gentleman from Illinois is now precluded from making a defense by the adoption of the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The House has already ordered the previous question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in all fairness—

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will be seated until the gentleman from New York concludes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York desires to present a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In all fairness, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the previous question was ordered be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RANKIN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 144, noes 35.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, since I was deprived of the opportunity to answer the gentleman from Mississippi before the vote was taken, I ask unanimous consent to address the House now for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied if I had been given an opportunity at least for 5 minutes to address the House, before the vote was taken, and answered the gentleman from Mississippi, you would not have voted to strike my speech from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because there is nothing in that speech which is in any way in violation of the rules or attacks or affronts the dignity of the House. If anything, I was defending the House of Representatives

and its Members. It is true that after I had concluded my remarks on the floor of the House I went to my office and was handed the Washington Daily News. In that newspaper I saw an article by Mrs. Roosevelt. I realize now that if I had had time to read the article carefully, I would have eliminated the word "subversive." But, unfortunately, in revising my speech I failed to notice that word and it remained. Now that is the only real objection that the gentleman from Mississippi has to my speech, namely, the insertion of Mrs. Roosevelt's article which appeared in the News of yesterday. I am not going to reread the entire article, although it might be proper for me at this time to read at least a portion of it. Mrs. Roosevelt states:

It seems to me that the current proceedings that the House Un-American Activities Committee have directed against Edward Condon, instead of giving the people complete confidence—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry is whether the gentleman may now proceed to again read that article which has just been stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. SABATH. I will not read that part of the article.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then you propose to leave out just one word?

Mr. SABATH. It is only the word "subversive," which is in the headline.

Mr. Speaker, if there is objection to it, I will not read it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that under the rules of the House no Member can read anything into the RECORD while speaking from the floor.

The SPEAKER. Under the procedure that has been followed in the House, Members have been permitted to read, and if the gentleman from Michigan insists upon his point of order, the Chair will put that question to the House to decide.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that mean that the rule is not being enforced today? Is that it?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I will not read the article.

I repeat, if the Members of the House would read my speech, I am satisfied that they would not have voted as they did. But, unfortunately, under the rules of the House when a Member moves to eliminate certain matter from the RECORD, that Member has the right to move the previous question and thereby denies the Member whose remarks are proposed to be stricken the right to be heard.

Under that rule the Member whose remarks are objectionable to a complainant has no opportunity to argue to the House his position that there is nothing in a speech that is really objectionable. I am satisfied that perhaps the word "subversive" in Mrs. Roosevelt's article is a reflection upon that committee which I did not intend to include.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. In another insertion which is more vicious than that one it is said:

That they—

Referring to the Committee on Un-American Activities—

continue the practice of Hitler and Himmler, which would lead America, as it did Germany, down the road toward fascism.

Mr. SABATH. What insertion is that?

Mr. RANKIN. It is signed by Milton T. Raynor, chairman of the Chicago Action Council. I do not know who he is; but all through these insertions the same class of material is found.

Mr. SABATH. Those insertions are opposed to the unfairness of that committee. I have stated on the floor many times that I am willing to vote 10 times the amount the committee gets if it would investigate all un-American activities. I still maintain that the committee has not investigated all un-American activities, but it has devoted itself to investigating only a few people here and there in the departments; and so far, I think the work has not been performed as I intended when I reported out the first and the second resolutions. I actually helped very materially in the creating of the Committee on Un-American Activities; and I feel that that committee should be fair to all groups of the country. It should without fear or favor investigate all un-American activities. There are some who escape attention that are just as undesirable insofar as communistic activities are concerned as the few who are brought to account.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In the last 2 days we have had some very learned remarks made on the atomic bomb. I wonder if the membership of this House thinks it passing strange that the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy do not take the floor to discuss this matter. I suggest to those who are interested in it that there is a very distinguished group of gentlemen in the other body on this particular committee, and, leaving the present speaker out of it, I submit there are also other members who have the confidence of the House possibly. Now when you want some expert advice on medicine you go to a doctor to get it; but I am going to pass that particular point and I am going to clarify this American Soviet Friendship Council and the American Soviet Scientific Society if the gentleman will yield for a moment.

Mr. SABATH. I yield for a moment but I do not want the gentleman to take up all my time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I refer to page 2442 of yesterday's RECORD at the middle of the right-hand column for a little actual information and a list of the membership of this particular society of which Dr. Condon is a member. For additional information I refer to page 9772 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 22, 1947. I might say that some of the most famous

scientists in America are also on this list and some of the greatest industrial scientists and industrialists of America are also members of this distinguished 400 of the particular Soviet-Science Society of which Dr. Condon is a member.

Mr. SABATH. Now, Mr. Speaker, naturally I deplore this vote of the House, but, personally, I feel that my speech, due to the fact that it has been stricken from the RECORD on motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will receive greater attention throughout the Nation than I could possibly have obtained for it even though I had ordered a million copies of it reprinted, which I did not intend to do, because it is a costly procedure. However, I feel that the action of the gentleman from Mississippi—and this is not the first time—is manifestly unfair.

There is nothing said in my own remarks that could be criticized by any impartial, open-minded man. Naturally, I put in a few of the letters that I had received and a few editorials and articles, just as we do everyday. Perhaps I did not read them carefully, being an extremely busy man, but there is nothing in all those communications that I have received that in any way affects the dignity and integrity of the House, itself. It is merely criticism of the Committee on Un-American Activities because of its unfairness in many instances.

I shall not detain the House further. Personally I feel that the people I represent and the vast majority of the other American people who believe in fair play will not approve of the action of the House and will stand by me as they have in the past.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. It would appear, would it not, that if we pursue this policy of striking out everything that a Member says, not restricting the motion to strike out the objectionable matter but if we continue the policy of striking out the entire remarks of a Member of Congress it amounts to placing a gag on every individual Member here; it means that only one side to a question can be heard; it means that the other side will be denied its rights to express its own opinion on the floor of this House. When that time comes, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a sorry day for America—when you will not let a Member express his own views on the floor of this House. The voters in a Member's district are the people who are to say whether he is a proper man to represent them or not. They will say whether his remarks are proper or not. But when the situation comes about that one Member can gag another and take away his rights as a Member of Congress, certainly that is not good for America.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. What I object to, and I object most seriously, is his inserting these slanderous attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Had I had time on yesterday I would have answered the

gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] on his attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities, one of the most unwarranted attacks I have ever heard on a committee of this House.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I only yielded to the gentleman from Mississippi for a question. I am pleased to hear that the gentleman from Mississippi did not object to my own personal statement but merely to the matter I inserted.

Mr. RANKIN. Do not misunderstand me to say that I agree with it. What I objected to was the extraneous matter the gentleman inserted.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman did not make his point of order against what I actually said on the floor; it was merely to the insertions. I fully appreciate that the gentleman does not often agree with my views. Now, these insertions come from outstanding organizations, they are editorials from outstanding newspapers, such as the Chicago Sun and Times and others.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. I do not agree with what the gentleman is saying, of course; but I think this point ought to be cleared up. It seems there has been great antipathy worked up about Dr. Condon not being heard by the committee. The full committee has not yet met on this Condon matter. Dr. Condon was assured by me last week that he would have an opportunity to come before the committee and explain or say anything he wants to say.

Mr. SABATH. I am glad the gentleman has made that statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to call the attention of the membership of the House to an attack that occurred by the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities in last June's American Magazine, when at that time he blasted out Dr. Condon to the public. Dr. Condon on July 9 wrote a letter to the committee and to members of the committee asking to be heard to answer these charges. This recent report that was put out to the press by the subcommittee was put out without giving him a chance to appear. He has asked to appear. He has not yet been notified to appear. I trust that the gentleman will see that he does appear, and I am confident that the gentleman will.

I point out to the House that it is a little bit late after a man's character has been assassinated to give him a chance to appear.

Mr. SABATH. In conclusion, I desire to state that under the leave granted me yesterday I inserted letters, telegrams, resolutions, articles, and editorials from the following:

Telegram of Committee of One Thousand; two editorials from the Washington (D. C.) Post entitled "Turning on the Light and Subversive Lists"; letter from the American Civil Liberties Union; letters by Prof. J. D. Lewis, political science department, and Prof. J. Milton Yinger, department of sociology, Oberlin College;

copy of letter addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by Albany, N. Y., chapter of the Progressive Citizens of America; letter from the Washington State Conference of Roosevelt Democrats, Spokane, Wash.; resolution of the Public Forum of Spokane and the Island Empire, Spokane, Wash.; resolution of the Minnehaha Farmers' Union, Humboldt, S. Dak.; excerpt of letter by the Progressive Citizens of America, Chicago, Ill.; statement adopted by the executive committee in the form of a letter to Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS by the Chicago division of the American Civil Liberties Union; article by K. N. Landis, Chicago Sun-Times, entitled "A Smear Abetted"; editorial opinion in the March 6, 1948, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times entitled "Our Scientists and Red Spies."

These are in addition to the articles by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Mr. T. Milton Raynor, chairman, Chicago Action Council.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that the House has considerable business to transact.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have important matters to be considered this afternoon, and I think under these circumstances we ought to proceed with the business of the House. I must object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks, and I hope they will not be stricken out of the RECORD again.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman going to insert in there—excerpts again?

Mr. SABATH. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OWNERSHIP OF STOCK INTEREST IN FREIGHT FORWARDERS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 1, during the calling of Consent Calendar, I objected to the passage of H. R. 3692. I just want to state that on next Monday, March 15, when this bill is again called, an amendment will be offered which will correct the situation to which I objected.

I regret that it will be impossible for me to be present to offer this amendment, but I do want all concerned to know that if the amendment to be offered is adopted that I will have no further objection to H. R. 3692.

SELECTION FOR ELIMINATION AND RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2744) to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2744, with Mr. HOLMES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, referring to the pending bill covering retirements within all branches of the armed services, H. R. 2744, I wish to commend the chairman of the Retirement Subcommittee, the gentleman from California, Hon. LEROY JOHNSON, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], and their associates of this subcommittee upon the long and careful consideration given to its provisions in hearings and otherwise in the development of this measure.

Its importance is significant and of particular value to members of the National Guard of the several States and to the Reserve Corps for it recognizes them as they should be recognized, and will mean much in the future in the permanent development of these two branches.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of acrimonious discussion here today, but I hope now we may eliminate all that and proceed to the consideration of a bill that has for its purpose the promotion of the safety and security of the United States of America. The bill before us today contains three titles.

Title I provides for the elimination of certain Army officers in the Regular Army. Title II modifies the retirement system in a minor particular so far as the Regular Army is concerned, and title III provides for retirement pay for Reserve components of the Army. All of these, except the last one, are merely changes in the law that we now have. The last title is an entirely new innovation in the handling of Reserve components of the armed forces.

Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the particular provisions of the bill I would like to say a word or two in regard to our committee. This bill was offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] who has pioneered in this legislation since 1940. When the bill was under consideration we made a number of changes and after completing very exhaustive hearings I asked our chairman whether he wished me to introduce the bill in the name of the chairman or in my own name. He said he did not want to substitute his name as the author of the bill but that I might introduce it in

my name if I wished to, but I declined to do so. The point I wish to make particularly is that so far as the Committee on the Armed Services is concerned there is not one bit of partisanship in its considerations. We consider bills from anybody, no matter what the political party of the author may be. We leave their names on the bills after hearings have been held and they are modified. We are a unit in trying to formulate sound policies that will help the defenses and security of the United States, regardless of party or regardless of partisanship.

Coming now to title I of the bill, the set-up in this title provides, in my opinion, an equitable system of getting rid of incompetent Army officers. Following World War I we had proceedings under section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act. This system was so ineffective that of 1,400 officers who were listed as incompetent, and not worthy of remaining in the Army by boards that listened to their cases, only 238 were finally removed from the rolls. The present bill, we believe, will correct this situation. The situation was so bad with the advent of the Second World War, that the Chief of Staff came to the Committee on Military Affairs and requested a law, known as Public Law 190, which provided a summary way of removing officers from the Army; in other words, the Chief of Staff was so apprehensive with the increased responsibility of the Army that he said, "We must find some way to eliminate these incompetent officers."

How do we do it under the present bill? First we have what you call a Board of Inquiry of three general officers. These men look over the records of all of the regular commissioned officers of the United States Army. If their efficiency records show that they are down the list, or that they may be inefficient, or inept, or not doing good work, as reflected by these records, they are then ordered by this board to show cause why they should be retained in the Regular Army. Then they have a full hearing before a Selection Board consisting of five general officers. They have the right to have all their records presented which are relevant to the hearing before the Selection Board. They have the right to have counsel. They have the right to look at the complete files insofar as they pertain to their qualifications as Regular Army officers. They have open hearings before this board of officers. When this Selection Board has heard their cases, they can make one of two decisions: One, that the officer be retained on the Regular list. If that happens, that ends the case. The other is that he be recommended for removal from the Army. Then the man has a right to go before a board of review. In the hearing before this board the officer has the same right to his record, to present testimony, to present witnesses, to be represented by counsel, and so forth.

When this Board finally gets through with its proceedings, it may make one of two decisions: One is that the man be removed. In that event they recommend that the Secretary of War, under the rules that he prescribes, in his discretion, may remove the man from the

list of officers. If the Board determines that he should not be removed, the officer remains on the list of regular officers.

Each year they review these substandard officers. The testimony shows that in a great mass of cases the defects of an officer, his bad habits, his noninterest in the work, and all those things, creep out in the first 10 years of his service and we firmly believe from the testimony we heard that if this law is enacted, during the first 10 years of a man's service we will be able to weed out 95 percent of those officers who should not remain on the rolls, because they are inept or inefficient, have formed bad habits, or numerous other things; in other words, it will solve the problem of attrition better than has ever been handled by the Army before.

The second title of this bill provides a little change in the retirement system for Regular Army officers. On the books today is a law that provides that after 15 years of service a commissioned officer may make application for voluntary retirement. We have increased that to 20 years. In other words, he must remain on the rolls for 20 years before he can make application for voluntary retirement. You understand that this is nondisability retirement. In the event that he is granted voluntary retirement, he is paid 2½ percent per year of his regular active duty and longevity pay, multiplied by the number of years of his service, not to exceed in any case 75 percent.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. On page 9, in speaking of these officers, you say from 20 to 30 years of active service. Do you in any way anticipate that that might cut out the privilege that officers have at the present time of retiring when they have perhaps 32 or 33 years of service?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not; no. Maybe it should read 20 to 30 years and more. I do not anticipate the point the gentleman makes will be raised, as I think it is very technical.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am just trying to cover a possible misinterpretation by the Comptroller General.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not believe that will happen.

We also provide in this bill that officers retired from the Army and the Air Forces should have the right to be retired at their highest temporary rank held between September 9, 1940, and June 30, 1946. This was allowed to take care of Army officers and put them on a parity with the Navy. During the war a law had been passed in which it was provided that naval officers who were retired should be retired at the highest temporary rank held by them. This was not afforded Army officers, and we feel that now, especially since the services are merged, this should apply to Army officers as well.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think it may be well for the chairman of the subcom-

mittee to inform the committee that this legislation simply provides the Army with the same machinery the Navy now has in regards to the retirement of naval officers also to get rid of incompetent officers.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct in both particulars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I believe it may be helpful if my distinguished friend also points out that in the Army, since there were Army of the United States officers or temporary officers who had only one rank, serving side by side with regulars who had both temporary and permanent rank, the permanent rank in most instances being lower than the temporary rank, there was a situation where men would become disabled doing the same work or exposed to the same hazard, and the Army of the United States or temporary officer would be retired at his highest rank, because it was the only rank he had, but the permanent, Regular officer would be retired at a lower rank, even though he was injured at the same time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I received a letter this morning asking a question about this bill. I wonder if the gentleman can answer it. This man says:

I had ROTC in college and had 4 years of ROTC or National Guard after I left college. As a Reserve officer, I was called into the service and served over 5 years. Now I am back on inactive duty. What effect will this bill, if enacted into law, have on those in my class?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We have a system of retirement for Reserves. I am talking now about the Regular Army, the professional soldiers. We will come to the Reserves later.

Mr. MICHENER. I withdraw my question until then.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We are going to discuss that in just a moment.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Has the gentleman any estimates of the over-all cost to the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, we have estimates of the cost. I am going to discuss that later, and if I do not, I wish you would call my attention to it, and I will be glad to respond to this request.

Mr. Chairman, we come to the third portion of the bill. Some of the details will be elaborated on by my colleagues on the other side, I am quite sure, when they address you. The basic idea underlying the third part of this bill is that in any war that we may have in the future, on the basis of our past experi-

ence, the Reserves will be the most important part of our Army. In the first World War, for instance, there were only five regular divisions. I could personally name you 10 National Guard divisions and 10 National Army divisions that fought and helped to win that war. Furthermore, we have had the situation in the past where we have had time to prepare for emergencies. Twice in the lifetime of every Member in this Chamber that has happened. In the First World War we had several years. We could see the last war coming from 1940 on, and we were pushed into it at the end of 1941. From what we know today, what will happen in the future, and we are sure that it will happen if another war should be forced upon us will be that we will have no time for preparation. A Pearl Harbor attack will be on us right here at home. You know the explosive state that the world is in. You know how small the world is. You know there are elements in the world who are not beyond making an attack on the richest Nation in the world, providing that they believe that they can put it over. I can not help repeating to you the testimony of a Catholic father, Father Walsh, who appeared before our committee on another bill. He said, in substance:

"I want to point out to you gentlemen that there is one power in the world that will not hesitate to attack."

He also said, "Do not fool yourselves about that."

That man has had 35 years' experience in international affairs. He is one of the best-known men in the world on the problems of the Near East. He said, "There is one group in this world that will only ask one question before they attack. That is: 'Will the attack be successful?'"

Now with that as a premise and a background and a rather sketchy one, I want to point out to you what we have in the way of benefits and incentives for the Reserves. I might say parenthetically that yesterday we passed a very good bill to stimulate service in the Reserves to harness the manpower in this country that has had war experience and to pick up those who were too young to serve in the last war and who are anxious to do something to safeguard the security of our country. We have a provision in this bill that if a man serves 20 years in the Reserves, at least three of which must be what we call active service, he shall then be entitled to retirement benefits at the time that he is 60 years of age. Let me see if I can explain to you about how the situation would work. Suppose that a man had served 20 years in the Reserves or the National Guard. Then over and above that he had 2 years of service in the last war and accumulated two more years of service after the war. Then he would have a total service of 24 years. How would he be paid and at what rate? If this man—and this bill applies to the enlisted man as well as to officers—assuming that this man was an enlisted man, if he had attained the rank of master sergeant, here is the way you would compute his pay when he qualifies for retirement on reaching age 60. For the 20 years of inactive or Reserve service, he would re-

ceive a credit of one-half percent a year. That is 10 percent for the 20 years. For each year of active service he would receive a credit of 2½ percent a year. Four times 2½ percent—that is for the 4 years of active service—equals 10 percent. So this man would receive the pay of a master sergeant, with longevity and other things added at the rate of 30 percent of the active pay. The pay would start on the first of the month after his sixtieth birthday, and would continue on down through life. We have shown you some diagrams here that give you a little idea of what a man would get. Referring to the example I mentioned—I do not have the exact figure, but taking 25 years, he would receive for the rest of his life \$568 a year, which is roughly \$65 a month. Now that is the thing that we believe will furnish an incentive to hold men in the service for a considerable time.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Is there anything in the bill that prevents duplication of pensions? For instance, a Reserve officer might be receiving a pension under another form of Federal security.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; there is nothing that prevents that.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. In the opinion of the chairman, would that be a wise provision to have in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the gentleman mean to prevent duplication?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Frankly, I do not know what situation the gentleman has in mind, and I do not want to give him answer unless I have an idea of what he is talking about.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. A man in Federal service might be a civilian employee.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. With respect to the Federal service there is another law that prohibits for dual payments in certain cases. If a man gets over \$3,000, he cannot get anything under this bill. That applies to Army officers, and I think that is a good rule. At least we cannot change it in this legislation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Where a veteran of World War No. 1 and No. 2 receives a pension as a result of disabilities he is not entitled to be part of the Reserves, and therefore could not enjoy the benefits of this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. any requirement in this bill now that makes it necessary for a Reserve officer to go back into active duty after the passage of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, there is. If he has less than 5 years active service, he must serve 2 years, after the last war, in active service. It is also contained in the report, in a table showing exactly what the situation is, and what service the man must have after

this war. It depends upon the length of service he has had altogether.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If he has had 20 years over all, active, and inactive—

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If he has had 20 years over-all he does not have to serve any time.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the lady from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Largely for the reasons so ably explained by the gentleman from California, I introduced H. R. 786 last year. As a devout supporter of reservists, I have the utmost confidence of the soundness of this bill because of the exhaustive hearings and serious study made by the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California. As a practical matter, under normal Reserve service will the reservists be able to get in the required postwar active duty?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I believe most of them will. The provision for constructive service will be a great help to them in building up active-duty time. Also, most of the Reserves are comparatively young and will have ample time to supplement their Reserve service, both active and inactive, by taking an active part in Reserve activities during the postwar period. Remember, that a man has until he is 60 years of age to build up the necessary time.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. They only get 15 days a year under ordinary circumstances?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, they have a program now in the Army like the Navy and also the Air Forces to call men in for extended duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair would advise the gentleman he has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

I want to say emphatically that I do not know of anybody who has made a more careful study of this problem than the lady from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. Furthermore, I know she has traveled widely throughout the world, studying the security problems first hand. No one in Congress has a better grasp of these problems. Last year I was a member of a group, of which she was also a member, and we traveled in northern Africa, the Near East, and all through Europe. No one on this committee was more diligent in trying to learn what the problems of our troops were, including the Army, Navy, and the Air Forces than the lady from Maine.

It is pleasing to this subcommittee to have the hearty support of the lady from Maine in our efforts to get this legislation through Congress. Her support will greatly enhance the chance of getting this bill through the other body. It is my opinion that no person in the House has greater good will among the membership of both Houses of Congress than the lady from Maine.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Will the gentleman tell us now the over-all estimated cost of this retirement system to the Federal Treasury?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In the report it is estimated that the over-all cost for the Reserve components starts at about \$51,000 in the year after the passage of this law, and by 1958 it would be \$1,455,000. In addition the Navy has the same general type. They have more Reserves and they are better organized. It would run up to roughly \$6,000,000. The extra cost on the Regular Army would run up in 10 years to \$5,118,000. In other words, when you consider the astronomical figures of the cost of national defense, these costs are rather nominal.

Mr. HORAN. Is it not true, though, that there might be some call to enact legislation similar, or remunerative at least, because of this legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not quite understand the import of that question.

Mr. HORAN. You are trying to increase the attractiveness of the service; are you not?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. HORAN. Of course we had quite a number serving in the last war. What I am trying to do is to find out what the aggregate cost of this program is and if they have been properly related to each other? Bear in mind that 80 cents out of the taxpayers' dollar goes for war or to pay for wars.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; I understand. It may ultimately reach \$33,000,000 a year, but there is great uncertainty because we do not know how many men will serve 20 years, nor do we know how many men will live to be 60. There are so many imponderables that we can make no accurate estimate of what the cost will be. My personal opinion is that many men will start but very few will stay in for the 20 years. Also, what we want to do with the legislation is to hold them for more than 1 year. We lost too many members of the Reserves before, just after they had been in 1, 2, or 3 years. We are trying to hold the men at least 5 years, and this is one incentive, I believe, that will help hold them on the rolls.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman regards it, then, as personnel insurance.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; and as security insurance also.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. As I figure it out, a reserve on inactive duty, his year counts for 2 months and 12 days; that is over half a percent as opposed to 2½ percent for the full year.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think it would work out that way; yes.

Mr. VORYS. So that a reserve year amounts to 2 months and 12 days of active duty. I wonder whether the bill has fractions of a year in computing active Federal service and how that would work out.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; it does not compute fractions of a year; it just grants the yearly service that he has, and he has got to serve a full year.

Now, he does get a constructive allowance each year of 1 percent if he takes the number of exercises, which, I believe, are at least 48 a year, toward making up the 20 years.

Mr. VORYS. One percent of what?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They give him a little advantage there, what is called constructive service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes. There are no requests for time except by two people. That is why I am taking so much time now.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I wanted to supplement the gentleman's statement by saying that for each year a reservist keeps up his correspondence work, goes to drill or training periods, does the summer camp work which is required to keep him abreast of military activity, he gets 30 days' credit toward active duty, credit toward retirement pay.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Then, could they accumulate the active duty service by portions of less than a year?

Mr. SIKES. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, yes; surely. I did not get that point of the gentleman's question. If they serve only 10 days or 12 days they still get credit for it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman from Florida said a moment ago a Reserve receives 30 days' credit for courses, drills, and summer training period. Is it not correct to say they receive 30 days credit for courses and drills, and in addition receive credit for a summer training period?

Mr. SIKES. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman state what this bill does for the Army compared with what the Navy does for the Navy Air Forces, the naval air arm?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What does the gentleman mean?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does this apply to everybody?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This applies to all services. The Navy has a somewhat similar scheme, but they all get the same treatment and comparable pay, and so forth.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does this give any advantages to the Navy air arm that it does not give to the Army air?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; not that I know of. The Army Air and Navy Air get the same benefits.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] a mo-

ment ago asked about the estimated cost of this bill.

Yesterday when discussing H. R. 3227, I stated it was cheaper to maintain a Reserve than a huge standing army. The Navy Department furnished cost figures broken down to an individual man. In the case of a seaman second class, we find it costs the Navy in sea pay and subsistence a total of \$1,500 a year. For a Reserve in pay and summer cruises it costs the Navy \$191.40.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In my opinion, this is peace insurance. We are at this time in a transitory period. If you will read Mr. Hull's memoirs or Mr. Byrnes' Speaking Frankly, or other books and statements similar to those, written by people who were and now are engaged in an effort to bring about a peaceful world, you will find that they very strongly recommend the retention of our armed strength while negotiations are going on. It is one way of saying that we mean business when we harness together into one effective unit the soldiers who served in the last war and the new ones who are coming up and are anxious to serve in the future.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman used the word "enactment." When does this program start and are there any retroactive features in it?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There are two small retroactive features in it that we are going to strike out. There will be no retroactive features then. It becomes effective upon the enactment of the bill into law.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Having in mind the bill of yesterday, and I am very much in favor of this bill as I was the bill passed yesterday, is this not simply another link in the chain that we hope to weld looking toward a strengthening of our national defense and making the Reserve Corps more attractive and treating those men more equitably than they have been treated in the past?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think that is a fair and very enlightening statement.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman mentioned that there are no retroactive features. Does past service count?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Why, certainly.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thought maybe from the answer to the question there might be some doubt. I understood what the gentleman meant but I wanted to make that clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Of course, all past service counts. That is assuming it has been satisfactory service.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Carrying that thought a little further, the gentleman

said that this bill becomes effective upon enactment. He has explained part of this to the gentleman from Connecticut. May I ask, though, under the bill as it now stands and as it will undoubtedly pass, how many men will be immediately entitled to the benefits of this act?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

The best estimate the Army could make was that in the event it went into effect in 1948 there would be 54 eligible in 1949, 71 in 1950, and it would work up to 687 by 1957.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In view of the bill passed yesterday which set up payment for armory drill and your summer encampments, to become entitled to these retirements must those individuals engage in drills or not?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The only way they can get credit for time is to engage in drills of some kind. We set up standards with which a man must comply. There are 48 drills a year, like the National Guard, then he can go to a summer camp and get credit for that.

Mr. SCRIVNER. What about the men and officers in the Reserve Sea units where you do not have drills?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They have to comply with certain standards that the War Department, or the Navy, or the Air Forces lay down.

Mr. SCRIVNER. What are those standards?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know what they are, but they will be comparable to what is required of the National Guard.

Mr. SCRIVNER. A National Guard officer has to attend drills and go to camp.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes. These people will have to do some type of work or go to camp.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think we ought to be told what they will have to do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We had some testimony on that. They have a plan that I think is sound. They set up a certain program and require so many hours of service and duty.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that Reserve officers who find themselves in either class A, B, or C will have to attend drills in order to receive credit for retirement?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes. That is provided in the other law.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, events in Europe emphasize today the need for action. Communism is sweeping eastern Europe and is threatening all of the liberty-loving nations of the world. Newspaper accounts of the serious wounding of one American soldier and the firing upon other American soldiers in Vienna emphasize the ugly features of communism. These occurrences, while but incidents,

serve to put us on notice that our own armed services must not be neglected longer.

In my judgment, we have sadly neglected the Reserve components of the armed services. We have not given them the legislation which they need to build up to their respective requirements. For instance, the requirements for the National Guard have been set at 680,000, and yet we find today only 250,000 members recruited. We are far short of the goal.

When this country was demobilizing, more than a million men expressed a willingness to accept service in the Army Reserve, either as officers or as enlisted men. More than 2,400,000 expressed an interest in continuing in all Reserve components. Through failure to act, hundreds of thousands of these men have lost interest in Reserve training. They have been scattered to the four winds and their addresses have not even been brought down to date. We are in urgent need of legislation to bring up to proper standing of efficiency the Reserve components of our armed services. The sweep of communism in Europe tells us we must delay no longer.

H. R. 2744

This bill fulfills a long-standing need of the armed services. For the future growth and well-being of our services, which includes both the Regular Military Establishment and the Reserve components of them, it is, in my opinion, most urgent and necessary that we pass this measure. H. R. 2744 is divided into three titles. The first two of them applies to the Army and the third title applies to all of the Reserve components of all services.

For many years the Army has been plagued with the problem of what to do with the inefficient, inept, and substandard officers. In the years immediately following the First World War, the Army grappled with the problem of the "hump." This was caused to some extent by the inability of this branch of the armed services to eliminate in a satisfactory manner surplus and substandard officers. Although conditions in the Army have changed radically since the conclusion of the Second World War, no adequate system of selection or elimination of officers who have failed to meet the minimum Army standards has yet been placed into law.

Title I of this bill is the answer to this problem. It provides for the naming once each year of a selection board of five officers. This board shall have the duty of sending the names of substandard and inept officers to a board of inquiry which shall recommend either the retention or the elimination of each officer selected. In the event the board of inquiry recommends the elimination of the officer, he shall have an appeal to a board of review which shall completely review his case and make its own recommendations, based upon its findings on review. In the event this board reverses the findings of the lower board, the case is closed and the officer shall not be subject to further action. In the event the board of review affirms the

decision of the board of inquiry, the case is sent to the Secretary of the Army for his action on it. The action of the Secretary of the Army shall be final and conclusive in removing the name of any officer from the active list.

Under the provisions of this title, the officer removed from the active list shall be entitled to retirement benefits if, under the law, he otherwise would be entitled to them had he voluntarily retired. In the event he has earned no retirement rights upon removal, he shall be entitled to severance pay, and this pay shall equal 1 month's base and longevity pay for each year served in the Army. The total amount of the severance benefits shall not exceed 12 months' base and longevity pay of the officer.

No back pay or allowances shall accrue by reason of this title. Provision is made under this title for the review of all records of officers removed from the active list under the provisions of act of July 29, 1940, commonly known as Act 190. It is felt that this relief is proper, as the officers removed from service under Act 190 feel that their cases were handled in a summary manner and without proper consideration. Only a few hundred cases are involved—thirty-six in all—and no great problem is anticipated.

TITLE II

This title of H. R. 2744 provides for equalization of retirement benefits for the Regular Army. The Navy has long since followed the rule that retirement shall be at the highest temporary rank or grade held during the late war. The Army, on the other hand, has retired at the permanent rank. This section extends the Navy rule to the Army operations. Temporary rank was given during the course of the late struggle when a high premium was placed upon armed services. Officers of the AUS—Army of the United States—possessed only temporary rank, and, under the law, they are retireable at this rank. On the other hand, United States Army officers have both a permanent and a temporary rank. They are now being retired at their permanent rank. This presents the anomalous situation of two officers, both of the same rank, fighting side by side until the end of the war, one being retired in his temporary war grade and the other being retired in a lower permanent grade. The committee did not think this situation fair and equitable, and the members have therefore recommended the change as embodied in this title.

Substantially the same rules applied to officers, warrant officers and enlisted men. Due to the failure of Congress to provide retirement benefits for nurses, provision under this bill is made for Army Nurse Retirement based upon the same principles and rules as applicable to other branches of Army service. The Secretary of War is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary.

TITLE III

For many years students of national defense have felt that some additional inducements should be provided for long

service in our reserve components. Too often in the past a young man has entered our reserves as an officer to work valiantly for a while, only to lose interest in his work and drop out. It has been found, especially, that the responsibilities of marriage and rearing a family have taken a heavy toll from our reserves. This means that the Government has spent much money in the selection and early training of our reserves who have dropped out before much usefulness can be obtained from the training which they have received. Before World War II it was found that 10 percent of the Army reserve officers left the service each year; and at the end of a 10-year period we had almost an entirely new set-up. It was found also that one well-trained officer is worth five untrained ones. It is now felt that no time will be allowed in the future emergencies for training as we have had in the past. We must be more adequately prepared in the future.

Friends of National Defense have been trying to find a solution of this very heavy attrition problem. One answer has been the suggestion of inactive duty training pay. Of course, this does help in the recruitment problems. It is not the answer to the problem of holding the interest and activity of the Reserve, both enlisted and officer, after he has entered the Reserve and become fairly well trained. We feel that a modest retirement system is the answer. Our committee therefore presents a plan of retirement benefits which shall apply to both enlisted and officer Reserves in all branches of service. Contrary to first thought, it is not an expensive proposal. It is estimated to cost for the first year \$408,000, and at the end of the first 10 years it is estimated to cost not exceeding \$5,000,000. Our proposal is therefore well within the financial limits of our abilities. This proposal will build up in the mind of the Reservist a credit for service retirement which will act as an inducement for continued service. The Government at a small cost will reap a rich harvest of efficient service from well-trained, long-service Reserves.

Our proposal is simple. This bill will provide that a reservist shall be entitled to service retirement at the age of 60 years, if he has served 20 years or more in either active or inactive Federal service. He will be given this retirement upon certain conditions. The first requirement is that, except in the case of those Reserve officers who have completed 20 years of satisfactory Federal service, a certain amount of future active Federal service is required. The amount of future service required depends upon the amount of past inactive service, and ranges from 4 years down to 6 months. In the future this active Federal service for a Reserve may be obtained by attendance each year at the summer training camps, by calls to temporary active duty and in other ways. A 30-day annual active-duty credit is specifically given to each Reserve who performs his duties satisfactorily and this may be applied toward the building up of his active-duty credit. It will not be easy for the average Reserve to build up his active-duty credits sufficiently to

retire at 60 years but this bill does present an attainable goal for each ambitious reservist.

H. R. 2744 allows each reservist upon reaching the age of 60 years, if he has at least 20 years Federal service, retirement at the rate of 2½ percent of his base and longevity pay for each year of active Federal service. It allows an additional credit of one-half of 1 percent for each year of inactive Federal service. The results are obtained by calculating the amount of both active and inactive service by this formula. The results are a modest retirement for the faithful member of the Reserve component.

I will take an example. A reservist with a total of 30 years of service, 10 active and 20 inactive, will receive a credit of 25 percent—10 times 2½ percent—for active service and a credit of 10 percent—one-half times 20 years—for inactive service. Thus the total credit on the base and longevity pay will be 35 percent. The answer in dollars and cents is easily obtained by taking 35 percent of his base and longevity pay at the time of retirement. In no event shall retirement exceed 75 percent of base and longevity pay.

This title is to apply to all Reserve components of all services. This, therefore, covers Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that this committee has been most painstaking in the study of the matter of retirements. It has studied the entire matter for many months. It has weighed each word of this bill and studied the far-reaching technical effects of each provision. The chairman especially has done a magnificent job on it and is entitled to the thanks of those who are interested in the building up of our Reserve components.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a new matter. Since 1941 I have been working upon the idea of a modest retirement system which should apply to our Reserves. Each measure that has been presented has been an improved one. Last year, our committee presented a measure which passed this House under a unanimous consent calendar but it was objected to in the Senate and failed to pass before adjournment of Congress. This measure is a distinct improvement of the one passed by this House in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It has the backing of every branch of our defense. It has the approval of our patriotic organizations. It has the endorsement of our Reserve organizations and has been the subject of study and work by each one of them.

Mr. Chairman, the world now is in a rather critical condition. Urgent problems vex us at every hand. Struggle for power on the part of other nations is evident more and more each day. The need of implementing the United Nations has become urgent and a clamor that its decisions should have force and effect throughout the world is being heard. All of this means need for a stronger national defense. As a nation, we are not able to finance a large permanent standing defense force. There is economy in our Reserve components. Our future as

a nation is dependent upon the proper organization and handling of them.

Mr. Chairman, in particular reference to H. R. 2744, I want to say that title I is very vital. Under the law that we have at the present time, which was passed during the course of the late emergency, Public Law 190 of 1941, we prescribed the means whereby any substandard or inept officer might be removed from the service. Now, that act runs out, according to its own terms, this coming June, and at the expiration of that period of time the United States Army will have no means whereby it can effectively remove from service inept, inexperienced, or substandard officers. So, title I is placed in the bill at the urgent request of the War Department, that it be given some means of relieving itself of officers who, by temperament or disposition, or perhaps acquired habits, are not of the type which the Army wishes to retain. This is not a criminal matter by any means. But, if a criminal case was being tried in our courts, you would first present it to a grand jury, then you would face trial court and then you would have the right of an appeal. The set-up in title I to guarantee all of the rights which an officer really can expect set forth in detail.

In the first place, the selection board is set up by the Secretary of War to meet once a year at a minimum. The selection board goes over the list of all the officers, selects those officers which it believes to be of questionable type or substandard, and submits the names of these officers to the Board of Inquiry, which is in a sense the trial board. The Board of Inquiry then permits the officer to have counsel and his case is tried by this Board. If the Board of Inquiry feels that there is a justifiable case against the officer, it recommends that he be severed from the service. The officer in that instance has the right to appeal. He takes his case before the appellate board called the Board of Review. The record is transmitted in full to the Board. The officer has the right again to be heard, to present his case again, with all of his defenses. Then if the Board of Review decides in effect that the Board of Inquiry was correct in its finding, it affirms the decision of the lower board and transmits its findings—not the record but its findings—to the Secretary of War. The holding of the Secretary of War is final in this instance.

If the Secretary of War holds that the officer is in fact substandard and that the service would be improved by the severance of his services from the Army, he so finds. The officer in that instance is given what is called severance pay. The severance pay depends upon the length of service the officer has had in the Army. If he has had 1 year of service, he gets 1 month's base pay and longevity pay as the severance pay. If his service is up to 12 years, he gets an additional month of base and longevity pay for each year he has served in the Army. If he is entitled to retirement under the present law, like others who are entitled to longevity retirement, then he is entitled to all the compensation of a retired officer in his grade and rank and with his length of

service. So the rights of the officer are fully protected, which they are not under the present law.

The proceeding is not summary. It takes into consideration all the rights and equities in the case. It gives the officer a full opportunity to be heard, gives him counsel, and gives him access to all the relevant papers and files in his case. We think it is a tremendous improvement on the present law and is vitally necessary, because the present law expires in June and there will be no law covering severance of officers if this is not passed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the machinery we are now setting up for the Army has been in operation in the Navy for years, and as a result only two or three appeals have been carried to the Secretary of the Navy by officers concerned?

Mr. BROOKS. The machinery the Navy has has been found very effective. We want to place the Army in shape where its machinery will be just as effective.

Further, Mr. Chairman, we want to take from the Chief Executive the load he has been carrying. We found under 24 (b), for instance, years ago, that every time an officer was disconnected from the service or removed from the active list he ran to the President of the United States and, despite all the important and busy matters the Chief Executive of this country has, he had to stop in the course of those matters, examine into the individual case, and review the full proceedings to find out whether or not the officer should be removed from the active list. The result was that the machinery was not effective, and the results were not satisfactory to either the officer or the service. This will accomplish the desired change, I believe.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Is the gentleman outlining a procedure which can be used also in eliminating and shaking out some Reserve officers who are not capable of fulfilling their duties?

Mr. BROOKS. That does not come within title I of the bill H. R. 2744. I may say that the Navy reserves the right at all times to go down its lists and remove anyone. The regulations of the Army prescribe the same thing. I am glad the gentleman asked the question. We have not been in a position to enforce the high standards of training upon the Reserves which the services would like to apply to them. The reason is that the Reserves have served voluntarily and without pay in the Army and the Air Force. They have served with a highly patriotic sense of duty. They leave their businesses, they go to their Reserve meetings and their respective activities at night and during the daytime, and they are subject to 2 weeks' call for camp, and are not paid except for the active duty in camp.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to suggest to the gentleman the experience during the last war was that we found many Reserve officers who had been in the Reserves for 20 and 25 years. Those men had developed seniority and were really blocking the progress of men who were more capable. I am wondering whether there has ever been any examination or any procedure to shake some of these people out as you have now indicated is desired for the Regular Army.

Mr. BROOKS. The treatment will be, when we get this legislation which was passed yesterday and this bill which we hope to pass today, that the services can then raise the standards of the Reserve, which they want to do. I think it has been our mistake in the Congress in failing to give them satisfactory legislation. Now we are going to do that.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. GOFF. It is my impression that Reserve commissions are only for 5 years. At least that is what they used to be, so that an officer who failed to live up to certain standards would not have his commission renewed. I do know that they established certain requirements as far as correspondence work and other matters are concerned. Such an officer who failed to live up to the requirements would have his commission subject to revocation under the regulations, which would take care of the situation of a Reserve officer who did not come up to the standards.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman has made a very pertinent observation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think we ought to make it clear, however, that title I of this bill applies to the elimination of officers from the regular Army. I just want to be sure that there is no misunderstanding about that. The Reserves are appointed for 5 years, but not so in the case of the Regular Army.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is there contemplated any plan or any procedure whereby we can get rid of Reserve officers who are inept?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, as was pointed out a moment ago, he is appointed for a 5-year period.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course, the 5-year period in the case of the Reserves is a period in which there has been no shake-down. That is why I am in favor of this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. That is the very point I have been getting at. We have not had legislation to back up our Reserves. We have wanted to have a high standard of efficiency for the Reserves, but we have been unwilling to pay or compensate that Reserve for the services rendered to the Nation. These bills, the one that we passed yesterday and the one we are now

considering, will in my judgment accomplish that result.

Mr. CARROLL. I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, when we approached the emergency of the Second World War, the Army found that we had approximately 100,000 effective Reserve officers. They found in going over the records that 10 percent of the Reserve officers dropped out every year so in the course of 10 years immediately preceding the Second World War, we had almost a complete turnover of the Reserve officers. The reason was that there was no effective incentive to keep men in the Reserve. A man started out full of enthusiasm and youth with the desire to serve his Nation as a reservist or National Guard man. He did well for awhile. But soon his enthusiasm waned, and there was no inducement at the end of his service to continue actively and enthusiastically and he dropped out. As a rule, the reservist and guardsman would marry and raise a family and it was necessary for him to be at home at night rather than at the armory for drill periods. Furthermore, he would not be able to get away during the summer for the 2 weeks at camp, and the increased press of business upon him also worked to take him out of the Reserve organization and the guard.

Since 1941 we have been working upon a program which would interest our Reserves in long-continued service. We found for instance that one trained Reserve was worth five untrained Reserves, and it was actually economy to our Nation to retain in the Reserves the same men, without a mass turnover every year. So we worked out this system whereby these men would be entitled to retirement. It covers both officers and enlisted men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Under this system contemplated in title III, a Reserve will serve 20 years and at the end of 20 years if he has a certain amount of active Federal service, dependent upon certain conditions, he will be entitled to a modest retirement for the service which he rendered this country in the Reserve components.

With reference to the cost, we found, as my colleague from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has just indicated, that the cost for the Army Reserves for the first year would be \$51,000; that at the end of a 10-year period the cost would be about \$1,500,000. Of course, the cost beyond that 10-year period will depend upon what Congress does in the way of increasing the Army Reserves and implementing it.

We found the cost for all Reserves would figure approximately \$5,600,000 by the year 1957. So, considering other expenses of national defense, we think that is real economy if we can retain these Reserves in active service by expending \$5,600,000 a year. I think that is genuine economy for our Nation to build up these Reserves.

All of the armed services came before the committee and testified in favor of

this measure. All of the patriotic organizations are supporting it. All of the Reserve groups are supporting it. They are actively for it. They think this is a measure which, above all others, will furnish to our Reserves, both enlisted men and officers, a desire to continue in service until they are retired under the longevity retirement program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, it is with great satisfaction that I rise in support of H. R. 2744, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], and to inform the House of the great importance of this bill to the reserve components of our armed services. To the gentleman from Louisiana, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings on the bill, I say without any qualification whatsoever that they and the other members of the Armed Services Committee have done a yeoman job in behalf of the citizen soldiers of our country, both past and for the future.

It is with reference to title III that I speak. You and I know that in addition to our regular establishments we must have trained reserves, trained so that on mobilization day they will be ready to take their places on the firing line in defense of our country. Practically, without exception, every military man of the permanent forces knows that in order to fight and win a war it is necessary to have trained reserves. The First World War showed the necessity for continuance of civilian components to the Regular set-up. Those of us who participated in that conflict know that the majority of the Army divisions were either guard divisions or national Army divisions. I recall with great pride the fighting records of some of the guard divisions—namely, the Twenty-seventh, Twenty-eighth, Twenty-ninth, Thirty-second, Thirty-fourth, Thirty-fifth, Thirty-sixth, and the Forty-second—and others with records just as distinguished.

We have always been a Nation depending upon a small professional Army and placing dependence upon a suddenly expanded reserve through calling to the colors the National Guard and the Organized Reserve.

Today of all times it is more than necessary for the welfare of our Nation that we have the trained National Guard and Organized Reserve divisions. We are living in a sick and troubled world and no one can tell when an explosion may take place. While we are fighting for a peaceful world, we must be prepared to repel any attack and by being so prepared, we are further assuring our own peace and security.

I have always been a great advocate of the National Guard of the United States. I have felt that with proper support and encouragement the National Guard can be and has been a tower of strength to our national security. I realize, as we all do, the many weaknesses in the Guard—but the weaknesses have

been soon corrected when they were given a military mission. I recall with pride the services of the 18 National Guard divisions in World War II—divisions which participated not only in the jungles of the South Pacific but also brought honor and glory to themselves and their States in the fighting in the European theater.

I am proud of my 25 years' association with the National Guard, both with officers and enlisted men; and I recall with pride the many hours daily and nightly spent in the various armories studying, reading, and delving into military subjects preparing for M-day.

I remember many times hearing such remarks as "Is it worth while?" "Who cares—all we get is trouble. Trouble with our families for spending too much time away from them—and trouble with our business for spending far too much time away from it." I have always felt that what the Guard and Reserves needed was a system whereby the individual, whether he be commissioned or enlisted, would receive, after years of faithful service, some remuneration in the way of retirement, which in a measure would recompense him for his long and faithful service to his State and to his country.

I am convinced that in the bill presently before us we have the answer. It is a step toward the future of the guard and the Organized Reserve and in my opinion will be the greatest morale booster this Congress can provide for those men who are not professional soldiers but who, in addition to earning their daily bread, are also performing great service to their country in training not only themselves but thousands of others for their country's defense.

I do not intend to go into a detailed explanation of the bill. That has been ably handled by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] who has labored many long hours with his committee in shaping up this legislation. The bill has the endorsement of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other veteran organizations, the National Guard of the United States and the Organized Reserve. It should be passed, and I expect it will.

What a great incentive it will be to the men of the guard and the Reserve when they learn that H. R. 2744 has become law. There will be no more uncertainty in the minds of thousands who have wanted to spend time in the guard and the Reserve but who for business reasons and the uncertainty of their future as citizen soldiers have held back. Now they will know that in case of emergency and a long period of active service with the colors, their future is more secure. They will also know that they can look forward to some retirement after years of service in peacetime as well as war. They will know that their services have not been in vain.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to pay tribute to this subcommittee of the Committee on the Armed Services which has worked so steadily on this bill, also the committee as a whole.

These gentlemen deserve great commendation for their services not only to this Congress but to the country and to the security of the country in getting these bills reported out. A lot of us are prone to overlook the necessity for the bill passed yesterday and the one under consideration at this time; however, they are a vital part of our national defense program. These bills provide an incentive for those men remaining in the service who aspire to serve further and it also furnishes a gratitude to those who have already served.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this is a wonderful program. You can go back to any war in which the United States has participated and you will find that the National Guard and the Reserves have played a vital part in winning the wars in which we have been engaged. This bill also helps to alleviate a situation which has existed for some time, in that it gives our old, inept, worn-out officers a chance to retire and gives an incentive for the younger and more aggressive men to push forward with their own ideas so far as our armed forces are concerned.

Again, let me say that I wish to compliment these gentlemen who have labored so diligently on this bill which in itself might not be so spectacular, but nevertheless is a vital part of our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House is a further development, and a better development, in my opinion, of the matter of retirement both for the Regular armed services and for the Reserve components, than the bill H. R. 7063 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was considered and passed by the House in 1946.

I want to compliment the committee for its continued good work in analyzing and studying this entire matter of retirement for members of the armed forces and the Reserve components. No problem is more complicated or more difficult to understand I dare say than this problem now under consideration. It takes a great deal of time and care to understand and develop legislation of this kind. I know of the work of the committee quite well, and I know their devotion to this problem. I commend them very highly on the results of their work.

Mr. Chairman, there are some questions that are bound to arise. After discussions here on the floor I have come to a realization that some of the points that are written out rather clearly in the committee report might easily be overlooked by any one who has a specific problem. For instance, a young war veteran who has not very many years of service may wonder whether or not he must return to extended active service in order to qualify for retirement. As you can see from the chart prepared and now before you and from the committee report, he can get constructive service credit to the extent of 1 month per year

and over a period of enough years he can get his 3 years required service insofar as retirement is concerned. But we must understand that this bill has to do only with retirement and only indirectly does the whole provision for retirement rights become an incentive to the reservist to continue his active contact and connection with the Reserve components. That Reserve member must qualify under all the other requirements which can well require him to return to active duty even though that is not required in order to meet the total length of service for his qualification for retirement. He must meet all of the qualifications and all of the requirements set out by the armed forces to enable him to continue his status in the Reserve component. I do not want them to confuse those 2 requirements. I am very strong for the legislation here before us because it does offer a great incentive and a great inducement to the young reservist. We are looking ahead. We are trying to reward him for past services, those who have served so well, but most of all we are trying to hold out an incentive to the young reservist to continue his active contact with the Reserve forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. With reference to past services, they are so nominal that they do not amount to anything in the over-all cost of this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We do make a slight reward for past services, and we think we should. The first year it would amount to \$51,000; in 10 years it would only amount to \$450,000 per annum.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I agree with that viewpoint very strongly. We should extend credit and retirement benefits to those who have already served at the same time we are enacting legislation setting up retirement rights for future service. Such recognition of both past and future service is greatly needed to establish effective incentive and to compensate in part for the tremendous contributions our service men and women have made and will make in the defense of our great Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion for the RECORD of a Reserve officer who is called to active duty, say, in 1940, and is still on active duty with the Army, but perhaps not in the age bracket where he can be retired as a Regular Army officer. He is probably not a Regular Army officer. How would this bill benefit him? How would it protect his previous years of service as a Reserve officer?

Mr. SIKES. Under this bill any reservist must have had at least 20 years'

service on active- or inactive-duty status, must have reached age 60, and must have met minimum active-duty requirements, in order to qualify for retirement. Very probably your man has met most of the requirements except for age and total length of service.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course, if he should leave the Army within the next year from his present active duty, there would be nothing in this bill to preclude him from going back into the Reserve.

Mr. SIKES. That is right. He would be given an opportunity to meet the remaining requirements for retirement.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like the RECORD to show at this point that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is one of the pioneers of this legislation. He was also in command of the bill that passed the Seventy-ninth Congress, which bill contained practically the same provisions as title III of this bill.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement very much.

It has been pointed out that this bill contains three sections: First, to provide a method of eliminating officers of the Regular Army; second, to provide for retirement for officers of the Regular Army in the highest grade held; and, third, to establish a retirement program for the Reserve components of the armed services. While all of those are important, all of them meritorious, it is the retirement program for Reserve components in which I am particularly interested and to which I shall direct my remarks.

At this point, may I pay a sincere tribute to the fine work done by the author of this bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], and to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. Their untiring efforts to bring out a sound program will be of inestimable benefit to our national defense.

It was pointed out a moment ago that a bill substantially the same as the one now before us passed the House late in 1946. The only major difference was the inclusion of a proviso that officers retired for physical disability, unless they were obviously and patently disabled, would have to stand an annual physical examination in order to retain their disability-retirement benefits. The bill as it has been brought before you today does not contain that proviso. Perhaps in light of apparent abuses of the disability-retirement program which have since been disclosed, it would have been best to retain that proviso.

The bill now before us compares with longevity retirement program of the Regular services. As you know, members of the Regular services may retire after 20 to 30 years of service. In the same manner, H. R. 2744 establishes a retirement program for the Reserves based on length of service, a reward for long and faithful service. It has nothing to do with disability retirements.

This bill affects all Reserve components. I want that to be definitely understood. It affects the National Guard,

the Army Reserves, the Air Forces Reserves, the Naval Reserves, the Marine Reserves—it affects all Reserve components, and it is vitally needed.

The testimony before you yesterday and again today on the importance of the Reserves and their present weakness is too convincing to be overlooked. It is also convincing when we recall that all veterans' organizations and all Reserve organizations have gone on record as supporting this legislation. They are supporting it because it provides the second essential support for a strong Reserve organization. The first we passed yesterday in the form of inactive duty training pay. And in the discussions of that bill we saw clearly yesterday that the Reserves are the only backlog of trained men we now have available to implement our comparatively small standing Army and Navy.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Would it not be wise to have the gentleman from Florida bring out the point that while he said this was for faithful and honorable service over a period of years, the bill is actually to augment and build up the Reserve Corps of future years, and is not meant in any way as a reward for services covering the immediate past?

Mr. SIKES. My friend has ably stated an important point, and I appreciate his contribution. Of course we are looking to the future. At the same time we do not want to overlook those men who have served ably in the past. The bill covers all.

May I point out very briefly something of what is planned for the Organized Reserves. Let us use the Army alone as an example. The Army has outlined a program comprising over 10,000 Organized Reserve units. It wants about 5,000 class A units, which are the fully Organized Reserve units ready for immediate mobilization. It wants about 3,000 each of the class B and class C units. But here is the important thing for us to consider today. At the moment the Army has only 52 class A units, only 52 in the entire United States. Here 3 years after the shooting stopped in Germany, we have only 706 class B units—a total of 758 Reserve units that can be considered in any way ready to be called up for immediate service or that can speedily be readied for service. The Army also has about 6,000 class C units, but those are largely paper organizations, and much work and long delays would result before they could be made ready for effective service.

This should give a clear picture of the present status of the Organized Reserves. They are weak, woefully weak. They need stronger support, support from the armed forces, and support from the Congress.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. I notice in title 3 a complete absence of any remarks or reference to the Air Forces. Is that intended to be included herein?

Mr. SIKES. It is included and that will be made clear before action is completed on this measure.

Mr. BRADLEY. Would the gentleman explain in what way?

Mr. SIKES. This bill was written before the unification bill became law. Amendments are going to be offered by the committee which will eliminate any possibility of discrepancy between the services or lack of consideration for any of them.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, we know that morale in the Reserve organization is low. It is very low. This is a crucial period in the life of the Organized Reserves. H. R. 2744 will be a needed and a strong morale booster. This bill, together with the inactive-duty training pay bill we passed yesterday, will open the way for a live, progressive, strong Reserve organization.

It does not offer high retirement benefits. As a matter of fact, retirement benefits under this bill are comparatively low—an average of three to four hundred dollars per year for an enlisted man and \$800 to \$1,200 per year for officers. But to qualify for the retirement benefits, each person must meet rigorous and exacting standards. He must keep up his work in his military organization. He must keep abreast of what is going on in military science and tactics. He must serve for 20 years or more in the Organized Reserves or on actual duty. He must be 60 years of age before he can begin to benefit from this program. The cost to the Nation is very, very low in comparison to the benefits it will produce.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The point that has been so well made by the distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], is certainly proof that we are looking to the future and not the past.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, together with the one we passed yesterday granting inactive-duty training pay to Army reservists, is a vital step in implementing what is perhaps the most important program facing Congress and the Nation today, namely, establishing a sound, long-term, practical program of national defense.

In every war this Nation has had to call upon its civilian soldiers, sailors, and—in the last two—its airmen, to form the principal forces for both offense and defense. In the last war, well over 90 percent of the personnel of our armed services were drawn from civilian ranks. This is the approved American way and is less expensive than trying to maintain a huge professional force. However, in time of peace we have always failed to properly foster and develop these forces to our great sorrow and cost in time of need.

Just now our National Guard and Organized Reserves of the ground and air forces are in a deplorable state of disorganization and are undermanned. I am sure this is not the will of this Congress, so many of the Members of which

in both Chambers have seen active service in the Guard or Reserves and know their value and their needs. The appropriations called for have been willingly made and last year we increased by nearly \$35,000,000 the budget requests for these components. It was a most unfortunate blow to the development of their programs that in fiscal 1947, \$90,000,000—more than half of their allotted funds—were frozen by Executive order and the funds diverted presumably to Regular Army pay. Today, although the Nation is rich in millions of war-trained veterans, this wealth of material is being permitted to grow rusty from lack of use, even while we are actually involved in a cold war. The majority of our Reserves are confused or unassigned to any practical post of duty. Our National Guard is woefully undermanned.

In my own case, as a Reserve officer, with a background of experience including two wars, and much costly training, I would not know tomorrow what to do or where to go if a sudden emergency struck. And my case is not an exceptional one. Wherever guardsmen or reservists gather one hears the same questions. What is the program?

Whatever the cause of our unfortunate situation it must be remedied and a strong program developed. Universal military training, if it comes to pass, will not of itself solve our problem unless we have strong, active, and experienced civilian components. This bill, and the one passed yesterday, are essential steps in rejuvenating our civilian components. This is a matter of the very first importance.

As a matter of fairness there is a secondary reason why this bill should promptly become law.

It is a means of giving some economic security to a relatively small group of older veterans who are or soon will reach the age of 60, to whom the country owes much. These older veterans struggled to keep alive our civilian components during the long period of unpreparedness that followed World War I, then sacrificed much by abandoning their private enterprises or professions to serve in World War II. Many that returned without bodily injury were confronted with the necessity of starting business anew from scratch at an age when they were well past their prime and at which their contemporaries were looking forward to comfortable retirement. The officers of the National Guard and Reserves, who bore their full share of the conflict in two wars, are today, if uninjured, without any retirement pay, whereas their brothers of the regular service upon retirement are properly maintained in reasonable comfort for the remainder of their lives.

But the all-important feature is the future effect of this bill which will do much to encourage our young veterans to stay in or join up with the National Guard or the Army and Air Force Reserves. They will enrich these services with their skill and experience for many years to come. For the safety of the United States it will be a most worth while and inexpensive investment.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I take this time primarily to pay tribute to the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and also my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], who, to my knowledge, has spent 5 or 6 years on this problem. It is a very complicated problem as we all know and it has taken time to work out all the details. However, I feel that it provides benefits of retirements to a group which deserve it and should have it.

We have provided retirement for ourselves, for the Army, the Navy, the civil-service employees, the post office employees, and all others, so I think it is high time we took cognizance of the work and the time and effort that the National Guard has put in in the national defense and security of this country.

I strongly support this bill with the hope that it may become law before the end of this session of Congress. As it has been stated on this floor today, the Organized Reserves at the present time are very low in spirit. There has been little action taken to try to build it up. They have not received the attention from Congress that they should have received.

We also know their record in the last two wars. There is no use talking about that in this body because those of us who served in the First World War and those of you who are here today who served in the last war know very well their record. Their record was magnificent and they deserve to have this benefit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the other side.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly happy to support this bill, H. R. 2744, today, and with particular reference to title I of the bill. In the early months of my service in this House my attention was directed to certain injustices which had been committed upon former officers of the Regular Army under Public Law 190. The men in the cases I speak of were not known to me prior to my learning of their problems and difficulties, but when I heard their stories and saw the documentary proofs of their statements which they submitted, I became deeply interested in the entire matter. Pursuant to that I introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress a bill which does substantially the same thing as title I of this bill, and again in this Congress I introduced a bill which this present title I replaces.

I congratulate the committee on doing an excellent job in bringing to the House a bill which in title I, of which I speak, does about everything necessary to set up a retirement procedure. This is the third time the Congress has made an attempt to set up a dismissal procedure. First came the 24-B proceedings. These were superseded by Public Law 190, which was an emergency war measure

which will expire this year. The pending bill sets up a procedure which should be and I believe will be a permanent means by which the Army may get rid of undesirable officers; but in doing so the procedures outlined in this bill make the proceedings manifestly fair to those officers who are called up for retirement.

In going over the bill I find that while the procedures outlined take care of the situation for the future it is nevertheless true that under Public Law 190 the War Department acted in several instances in something of a high-handed manner and in a way which resulted in the unfair treatment of a number of officers. The situation with respect to officer retirement under Public Law 190 for quite a period of time during the existence of that law was that an officer would be notified he was to be retired. He was given 3 days in which to appear and he was given 14 days in which to assemble his testimony, his affidavits, and witnesses to defend his case. The average Army officer is a proud man, and when he is notified that he is about to be dismissed from the Army because he is inefficient and unqualified, the average man wants to defend his record. Under the Public Law 190 proceedings, a man who chose to defend his record and appear before the board and defend the case was literally and actually penalized. In a number of cases he was discharged, he was removed from the service after his defense effort, with benefits less than he would have had had he retired voluntarily. One officer who had been offered retirement for disability at 75 percent of pay, when notified of the pending action, chose to defend his case. He was retired involuntarily at 40 percent of his pay. Another was eligible to retire on pay based on the rank of a lieutenant colonel, but when he chose to go before the board and protest the action he was retired on pay based on the rank of major. This bill deals with such cases so that such things cannot happen in the future; but with respect to a very few cases dismissed under Public Law 190 such as the two I have just mentioned, the bill does not go back and restore the rights those men should have had except for the 190 proceedings.

I shall offer certain amendments which will merely give more equitable treatment to those very fine men—I do not think the number would be more than a dozen—who suffered by reason of the fact they elected to protest their cases and were given a bad deal when they attempted to fight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor primarily to pay my special tribute to the gentleman from Louisiana, author of this bill, a member of our committee. For 6 or 7 years he has endeavored to bring this type of legislation to the floor of the House for consideration. He has finally succeeded with the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. I also want

to pay tribute to him as a member of our Committee on Armed Services.

This bill, together with the one we passed yesterday, will do more to encourage the boys who fought in the last war and those who will fight in the next one than anything else. If Russia invades Italy, come the 18th of April, next month, a fact which might be more of a reality than we think, these bills are indispensably necessary to make our Reserve program a healthy one.

We have to reward the men on whom we are compelled to depend in time of emergency. These two pieces of legislation have that objective in view. To these men who are responsible for this forward-looking program to which we all subscribe we owe a debt of gratitude and our great thanks. For the nonpartisan manner in which the gentleman from California and the other members of our committee have worked to bring these pieces of legislation to the floor we are all grateful. We have but one thing in mind, the healthy condition of our armed forces, both Reserve and active, the National Guard, and every component and segment thereof. In the emergency which points in our direction these pieces of legislation reward those on whom we are compelled to rely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Crow].

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record as favoring the pending bill. In my opinion, it is one of the finest pieces of legislation that has ever come before the House, and I compliment the committee for the fine work it has done in this respect.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to support H. R. 2744 because of its great importance to the national defense of our country.

While I am deeply interested in title I and II of this bill, yet I want to confine my discussion to the general purposes of title II as it relates to non-disability retirement of Reserves.

As you may have realized, title III of H. R. 2744 represents a new departure in the field of retirement legislation. It provides retirement benefits for Reserve personnel based on years of service. Heretofore, with one minor exception, the only retirement benefits ever available to Reserve personnel were those based on physical disability incident to active service. The one exception to which I refer is found in section 6 of Public Law 305 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which reads as follows:

SEC. 6. When any officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps or the Reserve components thereof has completed more than 20 years of active service in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including active duty for training, at least 10 years of which shall have been active commissioned service, he may at any time thereafter, upon his own application, in the discretion of the

President, be placed upon the retired list on the first day of such month as the President may designate.

You will observe that section 6 of Public Law 305 permits the retirement of Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve officers who have performed more than 20 years of active service, of which at least 10 years must have been active commissioned service. As you can easily see, that law would affect very few people. Title III of H. R. 2744, on the other hand, directly affects all personnel of the Reserve components. Its object is to provide an inducement to continued participation in Reserve activities—by offering Reserve personnel an incentive which will hold them in the Reserve for considerably longer periods of time than the average Reserve has heretofore remained. Past experience has demonstrated that the Reserve components suffered greatly during the period between World Wars I and II from a very rapid turn-over in personnel. The implications of this turn-over were obvious—comparatively few personnel ever reached a point of advanced proficiency in their training, although a fairly large number had received, to a greater or less degree, an elementary knowledge of professional subjects.

In this connection, it is pertinent to point out that during the hearings on H. R. 2744 it was stressed by practically every witness who testified concerning the Reserve retirement provisions of this bill that the most effective type of Reserve force is one which is manned by personnel who have had extensive training over a period of years—not 2 or 3 years, but 10, 15, or 20 years. It was also pointed out by these witnesses that the direct monetary benefits payable to Reserve officers and men were so small that in many instances as the men grew older, became married, and took on family obligations, unless an additional incentive were offered them, they would drop their Reserve training.

In the present uncertain state of world affairs it should be obvious to any of us who are concerned with the national security that we must have a relatively large group of Reserves well trained and thoroughly competent to take over and deliver the goods in the event of an emergency—Reserves who are ready to man their battle stations on the double—not after a period of several months of intensive indoctrination.

Title III of H. R. 2744 is designed to further this aim of developing a well-trained Reserve, and seeks to do this by providing an inducement to continued service throughout the years of a man's life when he is best fitted for military service. This means, as I said before, not for 2, 3, or 5 years, but throughout the entire period of time during which, as he grows in professional experience and competency, he can be of increasing value to the service as a thoroughly qualified, and in many cases technically qualified, petty officer, warrant officer, or commissioned officer. Representatives of the services stated during the hearings that if they were forced to choose between a smaller group of men trained for a longer period of time as against a larger group trained for shorter periods with a

higher rate of turn-over, they would prefer to have the smaller group. They feel that if the same total amount of training is applied to a relatively stable group over a period of years with minimum turn-over the money appropriated will be far better invested. In its report to the House, the Committee on Armed Services stated last summer, "We are hoping that the provisions offered in this bill, which to many of us seem liberal, will be an incentive well worth working for. The result should be longer periods of service by Reserves and a larger and better trained force on M-day, should we be so unfortunate as to have another M-day."

We have dealt briefly with the purposes underlying this proposed legislation. Let us take a look now at its specific provisions by referring to the following chart prepared by the War Department:

Non-disability retirement plan

I. SERVICE REQUIREMENT FOR RESERVE COMPONENT RETIREMENT

Aggregate service credited at date of enactment	Total aggregate service required for eligibility	Total active Federal service required	Active Federal service subsequent to date of enactment
None.....	20 years....	3 years....	3 years.
Less than 5 years.....do.....do.....	2 years.
5 to 10 years.....do.....	4 years....	18 months.
10 to 15 years.....do.....do.....	1 year.
15 to 20 years.....do.....do.....	6 months.
Over 20 years.....do.....do.....	None.

II. GRADE IN WHICH RETIRED

Highest grade or rank, permanent or temporary, satisfactorily held during member's period of service.

III. RETIREMENT BENEFITS

A. Retirement pay commences upon attainment of age 60.

B. Pay formula: $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent multiplied by years of active Federal service at time of retirement multiplied by active-duty base and longevity pay of grade or rank in which retired, plus $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent multiplied by years of inactive service at time of retirement multiplied by active-duty base and longevity pay of grade or rank in which retired; maximum at 75 percent of active-duty pay.

In order to be eligible for retirement benefits under title III, a Reserve officer or enlisted man must meet the following requirements:

First. He must have reached the age of 60.

Second. He must have satisfactorily performed Federal service for an aggregate of at least 20 years in any one or more of the armed services or their Reserve components.

Third. In addition, he must fulfill certain stipulated requirements as to minimum periods of active Federal service as distinguished from inactive-duty service in a Reserve component.

You will notice that these requirements I have mentioned are indicated on the chart. Column 2, for example, sets forth the 20-year requirement. As you can see, it applies uniformly to everyone, regardless of the amount of previous service he has had. The active-duty requirements appear in columns 3 and 4. They vary, depending upon a man's previous service—as indicated in column 1.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I ask the gentleman what is the maximum number of years a reservist may use in computing his retirement pay?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Thirty years.

Mr. BRADLEY. I notice on the tables that 35 years is shown. That is what has sort of puzzled me.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Well, he can continue on for 35 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As I understand, there is no maximum; he can go any number of years that his span of life would permit.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As long as he is on active or inactive duty.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. He can continue on for 35 or 40 years in order to build up the necessary 3 years or 7 years of active duty.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, at the age of 60 he is subject to retirement.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, it would be possible for a reservist to accumulate, we will say, as much as 42 years which could be used in computing retirement, and this total might run a little higher.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct, but his purpose for continuing on for 42 years would be to build up the necessary service to make himself eligible for retirement at the age of 60.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Of course, there is a limitation of 75 percent that is paid.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

In some of the earlier bills which were superseded by H. R. 2744, the termination date of World War II was used. This has been changed so that the pivotal date is now the date of enactment of this legislation—whenever it may be.

For those of you who may care to refer to the bill, the eligibility requirements which you see on the chart, are found in Subsection 302 (a), beginning on page 15.

We said that a man must have satisfactorily performed an aggregate of at least 20 years of Federal service. What is meant by Federal Service? Does it refer only to active duty service or inactive duty service, or both? Does it apply only to service in a reserve component or to Regular service as well? To what organizations must a man belong in order that his Reserve service may be deemed to be Federal service?

The answers to most of these questions were found in section 306 of the bill.

Thus we find that Federal service includes both active duty—referred to throughout the bill as "active Federal service"—and inactive duty service in a Reserve component.

We also find in section 306 a complete list of the various Reserve organizations in which inactive duty credit for retirement can be obtained. These include the National Guard, Officers Reserve and Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the Naval Reserve Force, the Naval Militia in certain cases, the National Naval Volunteers, and the Marine Corps Reserve.

However, members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Naval Reserve transferred to those organizations after 16 or more years of active naval service are specifically excluded; retirement benefits are already provided for them under existing laws applicable to enlisted personnel of the Regular Navy. A similar exclusion applies to like personnel in the Marine Corps.

Included among other types of service which cannot be counted for the purposes of this bill are service in the inactive National Guard or on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve.

Does the term "Federal service" as used in the bill apply only to service in a Reserve component or to Regular service as well? The answer definitely is that both Regular and Reserve service may be counted toward eligibility for retirement. However, there are two limitations on the extent to which Regular service may be counted:

First. The last 8 years of qualifying service for retirement must be service in a Reserve component of the service in which a man is to retire.

Second. Simultaneous service in a Reserve component and as a Regular cannot be counted for retirement eligibility.

These limitations are designed to safeguard the basic aim of providing an incentive to continued Reserve service on the part of members of the civilian components. Without the 8-year requirement it would be possible for personnel separated from the Regular service—who are lacking perhaps 1 or 2 years necessary to qualify for Regular retirement—to avail themselves of Reserve retirement benefits merely by serving in the Reserve for 1 or 2 years after separation from the Regular service. As the bill now stands, a man with 12 years of Regular service may serve 8 years in the Reserve and his total of 20 years' service will be good for retirement purposes. However, if he has had 15 years as a Regular, it will not suffice merely to serve an additional 5 years in the Reserve—he must serve 8 years.

Now that we know in a general way what is meant by Federal service, let us look into the question of active Federal service.

Section 306 (d) defines the term "active Federal service" as including all periods of annual training duty, all prescribed periods of attendance at designated service schools and—I quote—"any other period of time when ordered to active duty under competent Federal orders." In its report to the House, the Committee on Armed Services makes it clear that this language is intended to mean that active duty credit will apply even in those cases where active duty or training duty is performed without pay or allowances. This means that Reserves

who are willing to perform such duty at their own expense—should sufficient funds be unavailable—will be protected.

In recognition of the fact that it might be difficult during peacetime for a man to accumulate the total active-duty credits required, section 307 was worked out as a partial solution to this problem. It provides that any reserve may receive 30 days of active duty credit for each and every year in which he satisfactorily performs a designated minimum percentage of all drills or other prescribed inactive-duty training. This credit will apply only to inactive-duty service performed after the effective date of this act. Also, the credit applies only for the purposes of determining eligibility—that is, it may not be counted for pay purposes as 30 days of active duty but may be counted in computing the active-duty requirements which you see on the chart. This 30-day credit will be given in addition to any actual active duty performed during the year and it may be granted even though the man has performed no actual active duty. Theoretically, if a man has satisfactorily performed all his drills or other prescribed inactive-duty training, and in addition, has also taken a 15-day cruise, his total active-duty credit for the year will be 45 days. At this rate, he could accumulate 6 months active duty in 4 years, 1 year in 8 years, and so forth.

Turning again to the chart, column 3 shows the total active-duty requirement for personnel in each of the categories indicated in column 1. Column 4 shows the amount of active duty which they must perform subsequent to the enactment of this legislation.

Now a man who has had some satisfactory service—but less than 5 years—prior to the enactment of title III may very well have had a total of 4 years of active duty—more than is required by column 3. However, he must perform 2 years more of active duty to qualify under column 4.

Some of you may wonder why it is that all previous active duty cannot be credited against the total active-duty requirement thus reducing the amount of active duty which must be performed subsequent to the passage of this title. The reason is simple and it is directly related to the basic purpose of the bill, namely, to provide an inducement to continued service in the future. Those men who have already had several years of active duty are of great potential value to the Reserve components. It is very important therefore that their experience be made available in the future.

On the other hand, as you also realize, any Reserve organization, or, for that matter, the Regular Military Establishment, if it is to be strong and healthy, must have a constant flow of new and younger men at the bottom. In this connection it may appear to some of you, as you study the active-duty requirements on the chart, that the new man entering service for the first time is getting off relatively easier than those who have served before. This situation represents simply a realistic recognition of the fact that it will be relatively more difficult for these men to accumulate substantial periods of active duty in the

future—during peacetime—than it was for those who served during the war, and hence already have a considerable period of active service to their credit.

Up to this point we have discussed the requirements for eligibility for Reserve retirement benefits; let us take a look now at the actual benefits which the person who is eligible will receive when he reaches the age of 60.

The manner in which retirement pay is computed is set forth in section 303 on pages 18 and 19.

In determining the amount of such pay, credit is given both for active-duty and for inactive-duty service. For every year of active duty performed, a person is entitled to an amount equal to 2½ percent of the annual active-duty base and longevity pay of the highest grade, temporary or permanent, satisfactorily held by him during his entire period of service. In addition, he gets one-half of 1 percent of such pay for every year of inactive service in a Reserve component. Incidentally, the retirement pay is based on what the active-duty pay of that rank happens to be at the time he becomes eligible to receive retirement pay, namely, after he is 60. Hence, he will benefit by any service pay increases which may take place between the last time he himself was on active duty and the time when the payments begin.

A ceiling of 75 percent of active-duty pay applies in all cases.

Before concluding our discussion I would like to mention a few additional points of interest in the bill.

First. Service in more than one Reserve component may be counted toward eligibility. Thus service in the National Guard may be counted in determining a man's eligibility for retirement in the Naval Reserve. Similarly, Regular service may be counted. In either case it should be remembered, however, that the man must have performed his last 8 years of qualifying service for retirement in a Reserve component of the service in which he applies for retirement.

Second. Under section 304, if the service Secretary determines that a person has failed to conform to required standards and qualifications, he may place that person in an inactive status for the purposes of title III. The term "inactive status" used here does not mean inactive duty, but merely that the right to accrue retirement credit has been suspended.

Third. Section 304 also directs the Secretary of the Navy to determine what has constituted satisfactory performance of Federal service prior to enactment of this bill. This authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy only since in the past the Reserve components of that service have been organized differently from those of the Army. In the Army it was possible to tell from the component in which a man served whether or not he took an active part in Reserve activities. In the Volunteer Naval Reserve, however, many people were very active while others were merely names on the list. Hence, it is necessary that the Secretary have authority to separate the type of Reserve service.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my analysis of the provisions of H. R. 2744 it is my opinion that this bill and H. R. 3227, which was passed yesterday providing inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, represents one of the finest contributions we can make to strengthening our national defense. Without strong Organized Reserve Corps the Regular Establishments cannot give to the American people adequate national security.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I regard this proposed legislation, H. R. 2744, as very important to our preparedness program, future safety, and national welfare. The committee is to be complimented on bringing this bill to the House, as it vitally affects our national defense. Particularly do I want to pay my respects and commendation to our colleague from Louisiana, Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, a member on the committee, for his untiring efforts and devotion to this program that will contribute so much toward our preparedness to meet any future contingency. A great number of people will be affected by this legislation if finally approved. It is only natural and just that they should be. They have given so much time and service to their country. They have contributed so much to freedom and maintaining the American way of life in resisting aggression and tyranny. Needed adjustment to bring about a more uniform system has long been recognized.

In addition to the establishment of a procedure for the elimination and retirement of substandard officers of the Regular Army and adjusting existing voluntary retirement laws applicable to officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army, it provides retirement with pay of officers and enlisted personnel of the National Guard and Reserve Corps of the Army, the United States Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and the United States Coast Guard Reserve. In other words, Mr. Chairman, this would establish principles of law by providing nondisability retirement benefits for members of the civilian components of the armed services of the United States.

In July 1941 Congress established a procedure by which officers whose performance of duty, or general efficiency, compared with other officers of the same grade and length of service, may be removed from the active list, if their retention is no longer justified. This was temporary legislation effective only for the duration of the national emergency and replaces during the emergency the permanent law which is a relatively cumbersome procedure unsuited to operation under conditions of war. Under this emergency or temporary procedure, an officer could be removed from the active list for inefficiency in the performance of his duties upon the recom-

mendations of a board of five general officers and with the approval of the Secretary of War.

Title I of this bill, H. R. 2744, establishes a permanent procedure which experience has shown to be desirable. It would modify and make into permanent law the provisions of the temporary act of 1941, which I think are necessary and desirable. It would provide for an annual review of the records of all officers of the Army by an appropriate board. Officers whose records indicate failure to achieve or to conform to standards prescribed by law or regulations would be required to show cause why they should be retained on the active list.

The officer may appear before the board at a hearing and present evidence in his own behalf. The board would make recommendations for or against his retention on the active list. If the board recommended that he be retained, the case would be closed.

If the board of hearing recommended he be removed from the active list, such recommendation would be referred to a board of review. The officer would have the privilege of appearing before that board and may again present evidence to show why he should be retained on the active list. If the board of review recommends his retention, then his case is closed and he is retained. If the board of review recommends removal, such recommendation is forwarded to the Secretary of the Army, who makes a decision which is final.

This procedure does not differ essentially from the present temporary law during the emergency, except that there is introduced a board of review which does not presently exist. This is believed desirable and perhaps necessary in order to safeguard the interest of any officer required to show cause before the originating board why he should be retained.

There is another modification from the present temporary law regarding the manner of disposal as provided for officers removed from the active list. Under the Emergency Act of 1941, the retirement of officers removed under its provisions who who had completed seven or more years of commissioned service is required. Retired pay is computed at 2½ percent of the annual base and longevity pay of the officer's permanent grade for each year of service completed and creditable in active duty by compensation. Under existing law, an officer with less than 7 years' commissioned service is discharged. Title I of this bill proposes to retire only those officers removed who are by virtue of their length of service eligible for voluntary retirement. Officers not eligible for voluntary retirement would be granted severance pay, based on years of service completed. Such severance pay would be at the rate of 1 month's base and longevity pay of the grade in which serving for each year of service completed. Maximum severance pay would be limited to 1 year's pay. This is believed more equitable in that present law requires the retirement of some officers who would not be eligible for retirement at their own request.

It is interesting to observe that under the existing temporary law from 1941 to date, there have been 36 officers removed

from the active list. Claims have been made that action in their cases was taken without affording them the right of appeal and review. This bill proposes to correct such discrepancies that might exist and without loss of seniority or any other right of such officer that may have been removed without sufficient justification. Therefore, this bill would work to the best interest of both the Government and the officer.

Another important feature of this bill is that it would amend the Army retirement laws to conform to amendments recently made to Navy retirement laws by Public Law 305, Seventy-ninth Congress. It would amend existing law for voluntary retirement of officers and warrant officers to require a minimum of 20 years of active Federal service for such retirement. Under present law, the voluntary retirement of officers and warrant officers is at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army after 15 years' service. This would require the same service for officers as is now required for Army enlisted men and of all Navy personnel. It is especially desirable in order to achieve a maximum uniformity among the Armed services.

Also, this would grant to all Army personnel who served in higher temporary grades during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946, the same rights to essential retirement in such grades as are now provided by law for Navy personnel under similar conditions as apply to Navy personnel. This too is important to bring about uniformity in all the services.

While the provisions of this proposed bill in titles I and II are highly important, title III to my mind is even more important to the future of our national defense as well as recognizing the outstanding services rendered by many of our citizens in the past. This is no departure in recognizing the importance to our national defense of personnel other than in the Regular Army. It is a policy that has been sought for many years. It is needed to increase the interest as well as to provide incentive for those in the civilian components of the armed services of the United States.

This new departure provides retirement for personnel other than Regular Army, and extends the coverage to all of those in the armed services of our country. Under existing law, provision is made for compensation in the nature of retirement pay for personnel of the civilian components of the armed services, who are disabled while serving on active duty. There are, however, no provisions for such personnel to receive retirement pay solely by reason of length of service, active or inactive performed, even though such service has been given to the defense of our country for almost a lifetime.

Title III under this bill would establish a nondisability retirement system, which would provide retirement with pay for personnel of the civilian components of the armed services who complete long periods of service in both active and inactive capacities. It would grant retirement pay, upon attainment of age 60, to any member of a civilian component of the services who completes a total

of 20 years' service in such a component. The service required to attain eligibility for retirement must conform to standards prescribed by the appropriate service Secretary. For those members whose service commences after enactment, not less than 3 years of the required service must have been active Federal service. For those members who have already fulfilled part or all of the general 20-year service requirement, the requirement for future active Federal service is reduced. The following tabulation is a summary of the service requirement:

Service requirement for Reserve retirement

Aggregate service credited at date of enactment	Aggregate service required	Active Federal service required	Active Federal service subsequent to enactment required
None.....	20 years.....	3 years.....	3 years.
Less than 5 years.....	do.....	do.....	Do.
5 to 10 years.....	do.....	4 years.....	18 months.
10 to 15 years.....	do.....	do.....	1 year.
15 to 20 years.....	do.....	do.....	6 months.
Over 20 years.....	do.....	do.....	None.

In the computation of retirement pay to commence at age 60, the computation is made on the basis of the annual active-duty base and longevity pay of the highest grade held by the individual. Retirement pay is a percentage of such pay with credit given at 2½ percent for each year of active Federal service completed and one-half of 1 percent for each year of service other than active Federal service completed.

The retirement provision of title III is designed as an inducement to peacetime service in the civilian components of the armed services. Between the last two World Wars it was extremely difficult to sustain interest in our Reserve components due to lack of financial compensation for time spent and due to program curtailments because of budgetary limitations. It is evident that in future wars the services will be more than ever dependent on the existence of highly trained and effective civilian components. Insofar as title III of this bill would hold out an element of eventual financial reward it is a long step toward the achievement of a strong peacetime national-defense system.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this 1 minute for the purpose of paying tribute to the chairman of this subcommittee and all members of the subcommittee. This matter arose originally in the summer of 1940, and in 1941 it became a legislative matter by virtue of the fact that I introduced a bill in the hopper of the House. The members of this committee have worked diligently and have done much work upon many bills which were submitted to the subcommittee during the course of these years. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] especially has been most faithful, diligent, and conscientious over the last year in matters pertaining to the Reserve and the National Guard. The Reserve components of all the services owe the gentleman from California a debt of gratitude for his faithful service. Mr. Chairman, the same applies to other

members of the committee who, I think, have always held steadfastly in mind what is best for the armed services of the United States and for the defense of our Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I shall not trespass on your time for the full 5 minutes, but I think I should invite your attention to two questions which I do not believe have been covered heretofore in the discussion. I want first to congratulate the committee for its fine work here which is a recognition of the fact that anything we can do to build up the civilian components of our Army will greatly strengthen our national defense. In addition to the arguments that have been made as to the incentive to keep these men in the Organized Reserve, I think we should not forget another point, and that is, that by reason of pay for drills and the right to retirement, it is possible for the Army to require a higher standard of service in the work being performed by both officers and men of the Reserve Corps.

I had the privilege prior to this war of serving as the unit instructor for a group of about 75 Reserve officers. I know we were continually faced with the problem of not giving these boys too much or we would scare them away, yet we wanted them to keep up their interest in taking these courses. If we could have said to them, "You will lose your retirement or lose your pay if you do not show up," then we could have required much more work than we did where they were doing it on a purely voluntary basis.

The other point I want to make is that there is a large number, but I do not know how large a number, of both National Guard and Reserve officers who have remained on active duty with the Regular Army. These men may or may not have been eligible for appointment in the Regular Army, but for reasons of age or other causes they were not appointed in the Regular Army. But they are staying on duty, they are performing a fine service, a service which the Army certainly considers sufficient to keep them on duty, yet the Regular Army officer with whom they are serving and who is doing a similar type of duty can look forward to retirement, while the National Guard or Reserve officer who is staying on has no reward to look forward to when he completes that active service. I think it is only fair that we should extend to these fine officers from the civilian components of the Army who are now remaining on active duty an opportunity to acquire at least a modest retirement benefit when they complete that service.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the Army has at the moment on active duty thousands of Reserve officers and plans to use thousands on active duty in the future?

Mr. GOFF. I believe that is true. I thank the gentleman.

Those Reserve officers who will go on duty will receive no benefits whatever unless this law is passed.

I want to say also that one of the problems we have in the Reserve is getting officers to take active duty. They cannot get away from their businesses, they cannot spare the time. But if we can say to them, "We cannot order you out in peacetime unless you go voluntarily, but if you take that active duty you are building up the requirements for your retirement," that will be one of the greatest incentives to get a lot of good men who feel they simply cannot stay away from their businesses as things stand now.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I believe this will induce a lot of young men just coming out of the colleges to take their term of active duty and get it on the books, so that in the long run they will be entitled to the retirement benefits of this statute.

Mr. GOFF. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. One of the things we need most is to keep these young officers on the Reserve rolls. If we can show them that they are going to receive some kind of benefit by staying in the Reserve, we are going to be able to take advantage of these men who are already trained. It costs a lot of money to train an officer, and we have these young officers who have come out of the Army who are already trained. If we can keep them in the service we are certainly going to save a lot to this Government.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that it is even more important to interest enlisted men in the same activity, along with the officers?

Mr. GOFF. That is true. It would work the same way with the enlisted men.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, like so many Members of this body, I have spent a considerable portion of my adult life in one of the components of the armed services, in the First World War, the Second World War, and in the intervening years as a member of the Pennsylvania National Guard. Having some comprehension of the problem which this legislation seeks to solve, I should like to place myself on record as being fully in accord with the bill now before this House, H. R. 2744. I propose to vote for it. It seeks to give recognition to these men who have so generously given of their time in the service of their country in the various components of the armed services. Service in the National Guard and in the Reserve is a time-consuming service. A young man who goes into the National Guard or the Reserve as an enlisted man gives up at least one night a week in drill. If he becomes a key noncommissioned officer or

a junior officer, he spends, necessarily, additional time over and above the drill nights. If he becomes a unit commander, his drill night is but a small part of the time he spends in the administration of his unit. In addition to that, for the length of his service, which may be from 5 to 10 or 15 years, for the average man in the National Guard or Reserve, his summer vacations are spent in camp and not, as is the case with most men, with his family. This bill seeks to give him some recognition for the time thus spent in the service of national defense over and above the time for which he gets paid at drill, and for which he receives no compensation.

I want to compliment the committee on doing a very fine job. I sincerely trust that this bill will be passed by the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill for amendment be dispensed with, and that the same be printed in the RECORD at this point and be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Army Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1946."

TITLE I ELIMINATION

SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, for such causes as may be satisfactory to him, to remove any commissioned officer from the active list of the Regular Army in the manner hereinafter prescribed.

SEC. 102. Immediately following the enactment of this act, and once annually thereafter, the Secretary of War shall convene a selection board of five general officers, which shall review the records of all officers on the active list of the Regular Army to determine which of such officers shall be required to show cause why they should be retained on the active list. Selection of any officer to show cause for retention shall be based upon his failure to achieve such standards of performance as the Secretary of War shall by regulations prescribe, or on other good and sufficient reasons appearing to the satisfaction of the Secretary of War and of which the selection board is advised.

SEC. 103. Any officer selected to show cause for retention shall be accorded a fair and impartial hearing before a board of inquiry, consisting of not less than three general officers, convened at such place or places as the Secretary of War may prescribe to receive evidence and to make findings and recommendations as to the officer's fitness to be retained on the active list. If the board of inquiry recommends the retention of any officer on the active list, his case shall thereupon be closed and shall not be subject to further action, except that such officer may again be selected to show cause for retention at any future time in accordance with the provisions of section 102 of this title.

SEC. 104. The board of inquiry shall forward the record of its proceedings in each case in which it recommends the removal of any officer from the active list to a board of review, consisting of not less than five general officers, convened by the Secretary of War at such time as he deems appropriate, to review each such case and make recommendations as to the retention of the officer concerned on the active list. If the board of inquiry recommends the retention of any officer on the active list, his case shall there-

upon be closed and shall not be subject to further action, except that such officer may again be selected to show cause for retention at any future time in accordance with the provisions of section 102 of this title. If the board of review recommends against the retention of any officer on the active list, such recommendation shall be transmitted to the Secretary of War for his action thereon. The action of the Secretary of War in removing any officer from the active list shall be final and conclusive: *Provided*, That at any time prior to his removal from the active list the application of any officer for honorable discharge or voluntary retirement under this act or any other provision of law may, if the applicant is otherwise qualified therefor, be granted by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 105. Any officer who is under consideration for removal from the active list shall be allowed to appear in person or by counsel at proceedings before any board of inquiry or any board of final review, and shall, at all stages of the proceedings, be allowed full access to and furnished copies of records pertinent to his case. No person shall sit as a member of more than one of the boards convened under sections 102, 103, or 104 of this title in the consideration of the case of the same officer.

SEC. 106. Each officer removed from the active list of the Regular Army pursuant to this title shall—

(a) if on the date of removal he has completed less than 7 years' active Federal commissioned service, be honorably discharged in the permanent grade then held;

(b) if on the date of removal he has completed 7 or more but less than 10 years of such service, be honorably discharged in the permanent grade then held, with severance pay equal to 6 months' base and longevity pay computed upon such grade;

(c) if on the date of removal he has completed 10 or more but less than 20 years of such service, be honorably discharged in the permanent grade then held, with severance pay equal to 1 year's base and longevity pay computed upon such grade;

(d) if on the date of removal he has completed 20 or more years of such service, be retired in the permanent grade then held, with retired pay equal to the retired pay which he would receive if retired in such grade upon his own application under section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 507), as now or hereafter amended.

SEC. 107. (a) The Secretary of War shall transmit the records of all proceedings in the case of each person heretofore removed from the active list of the Regular Army pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), to a board of review convened under section 104 of this title. Each person so removed shall be notified of the reference of his case to such board for review, and shall be accorded opportunity to appear before the board in person or by counsel. After full and fair consideration of all the facts and circumstances of each such case as they existed at the time of removal, the board shall transmit to the Secretary of War a report thereon containing its findings of fact, its conclusion on the question whether such removal was justified, and its recommendation on the question whether the officer affected should be restored to the active list pursuant to the provisions of this section.

(b) In each such case in which the Secretary of War approves a recommendation for the restoration of any person to the active list of the Regular Army, he shall transmit the record of proceedings to the President, who is authorized and requested to appoint such person, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as a commissioned officer on the active list of the Regular Army in the grade and with the seniority which he would have attained by operation of law if he had not been removed therefrom. In all other

cases the action taken by the Secretary of War shall be final and conclusive for all purposes. The Secretary of War shall transmit to each person affected a copy of the report made by the board of review in his case and written notice as to the disposition thereof.

(c) In determining length of active Federal commissioned service for all purposes of pay, allowances, appointment, promotion, and retirement, each person restored to the active list of the Regular Army pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be deemed to have served as an officer on the active list of the Regular Army from the date of his removal therefrom to the date of his restoration thereto, and upon restoration shall be carried as an additional number in the grade in which restored to the active list or in any grade to which he thereafter may be promoted. Each officer so restored shall be accorded all other rights, benefits, and privileges to which he would have been entitled if he had not been removed from the active list, except those based upon active service in time of war or emergency not in fact performed by him.

SEC. 108. (a) The Secretary of War may promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this title.

(b) No back pay, allowances, or compensation shall accrue to any person by reason of the enactment of any provision of this title.

SEC. 109. Section 24b of the National Defense Act, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 773), and the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), are hereby repealed.

TITLE II

RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS AND WARRANT OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR ARMY

SEC. 201. Effective upon the enactment of this title the Secretary of War shall establish an officers' retired list, to be published annually in the Army Register, upon which shall be placed the names of all the commissioned officers of the Regular Army heretofore or hereafter retired from active service under any provision of law, without limit to the number of officers who may be placed thereon. Any provision of law requiring commissioned officers of the Regular Army to be placed on the limited or unlimited retired list hereafter shall be deemed to refer to the officers' retired list established pursuant to this section.

SEC. 202. (a) That portion of section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 507), as amended by section 3 of the act of June 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 380; 10 U. S. C. 943a, 971b), ending with the colon following the first proviso thereof is hereby further amended to read as follows: "That any officer on the active list of the Regular Army or Philippine Scouts or any officer of the reserve components of the Army of the United States who shall have completed not less than 20 or more than 30 years' active Federal service in the armed forces of the United States, at least 10 years of which shall have been active commissioned service, may in the discretion of the Secretary of War be retired upon his own application with annual pay equal to 2½ percent of the annual active duty base and longevity pay of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service credited for longevity pay purposes and not to exceed a total of 75 percent of such annual active duty base and longevity pay: *Provided*, That in computing the number of years of such service for the purpose of determining the percentage of active-duty annual pay, and for no other purpose, any fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or more shall be counted as a complete year: *Provided further*, That officers whose computation of pay on the active list is not based upon years of service shall receive as retired pay 75 percent of the pay of the grade in which retired."

(b) That the fifth proviso of section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 507), as amended by section 3 of the act of June 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 380; 10 U. S. C. 943a, 971b), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 203. (a) Each commissioned officer of the Regular Army heretofore or hereafter retired under any provision of law (except section 24b of the National Defense Act, as amended, by the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), or any law hereafter enacted for the retirement of inefficient officers) shall be advanced on the officers' retired list to the highest temporary grade satisfactorily held by him, as determined by the Secretary of War, during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law, computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay which he would receive if serving on active duty in such higher grade.

(b) That the act approved June 12, 1906 (34 Stat. 245; 10 U. S. C. 946) is hereby repealed.

(c) That section 5 of the act approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 653), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. Warrant officers shall be entitled to retirement under the same conditions as commissioned officers: *Provided*, That hereafter warrant officers may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be retired after 20 years of active service: *Provided further*, That a warrant officer retired after 20 years of active service shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the annual active duty base and longevity pay at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service credited for longevity-pay purposes and not to exceed 75 percent of such annual active duty base and longevity pay: *Provided further*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years' service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied: *And provided further*, That any warrant officer heretofore or hereafter retired under any provision of law shall, upon the completion of 30 years' service, to include the sum of his active service and his service on the retired list, be advanced on the retired list to the highest temporary officer, flight officer, or warrant officer grade satisfactorily held by him as determined by the Secretary of War during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay which he would receive if serving on active duty in such higher grade."

(d) Each member of the Army Nurse Corps, established by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879), as amended, heretofore or hereafter retired under any provision of law shall be advanced on the Nurse Corps retired list to a grade with relative rank equal to the highest grade in which, or to the highest relative or commissioned rank with which, she served satisfactorily, as determined by the Secretary of War, during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946, whichever is higher, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay which she would receive if serving on active duty in such grade or with such relative or commissioned rank.

(e) Each enlisted man of the Regular Army heretofore or hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall upon the completion of 30 years of service, to include the sum of his active service and his service on the retired list, be advanced to the highest temporary commission, warrant, or enlisted grade satisfactorily held by him, as determined by the Secretary of War, during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946, and shall receive retirement pay at the rate prescribed by law but based upon such higher temporary rank or grade.

SEC. 204. (a) Members of the Regular Army heretofore retired who were called to

active duty during World War II and who are entitled under subsections (a), (c), (d), and (e) of section 203 of this title, to advancement on the retired list by reason of having held a higher temporary rank or grade shall have their retired rank or grade and retired-pay status changed to grant any increase benefits provided by that section. Such change will be effective, both as to rank or grade and as to amount of retired pay, from the date of reverting to retired status.

(b) Members of the Regular Army retired during World War II, except those retired under the provisions of section 24b of the National Defense Act, as amended, or the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), but not recalled to active duty and who are entitled under subsections (a), (c), (d), and (e) of section 203 of this title, to advancement on the retired list by reason of having held a higher temporary rank or grade shall have their retired rank or grade and retired-pay status changed to grant any increase benefits provided by that section. Such change will be effective from the date of such retirement.

(c) No person recalled to active duty after retirement shall be entitled, by the enactment of this title, to be recalled in any rank or grade higher than that to which he or she would otherwise be entitled.

SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary of War may promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this title.

(b) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to deprive any person of any higher retired grade or rank, or any greater retired or retirement pay to which he or she may be entitled under any other provision of law. Except as provided in (a) and (b) of section 204, no back pay or allowances for any period prior to the date of enactment of this title shall accrue to any person by reason of the enactment thereof.

TITLE III

RETIREMENT WITH PAY OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED STATES NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE, AND THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of War is authorized to establish the Army of the United States Retired List to be published annually in the Army Register, upon which shall be placed the names of all commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Army of the United States other than those of the Regular Army, heretofore or hereafter granted retirement pay under section 5 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 557, as amended, 10 U. S. C. 456), section 1 of the act of September 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 733, 10 U. S. C. 456a), and section 302 of this title, or any law hereafter enacted to provide retirement pay for commissioned officers other than those of the Regular Army, and the names of all warrant officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army heretofore or hereafter retired under any provision of law who, by reason of service in temporary commissioned grades in the Army of the United States, or any component thereof, are entitled to be retired with commissioned rank or grade.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish a United States Naval Reserve Retired List to include the names of all officers and enlisted personnel of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve who are granted retired pay under the provisions of this title, the provisions of Public Law 305, Seventy-ninth Congress, or any law hereafter enacted to provide retired pay for such officers and enlisted personnel.

SEC. 302. (a) Any person who, upon attaining the age of 60 years, has satisfactorily performed Federal service in the status of a commissioned officer, warrant officer, flight officer, or enlisted person in the Army of the

United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and also including the federally recognized National Guard prior to 1933, the United States Navy including the Reserve components thereof, or the United States Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, and has completed an aggregate of 20 or more years of such satisfactory service in any or all of the aforesaid services, shall be granted retired pay if he fulfills any of the requirements enumerated below:

(1) If he has completed no satisfactory Federal service in any of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 3 years of active Federal service subsequent to that date.

(2) If he has completed some service, but less than 5 years of satisfactory Federal service in any or all of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 3 years of active Federal service, at least 2 years of which must have been served subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(3) If he has completed 5 years, but less than 10 years of satisfactory Federal service in any or all of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 4 years of active Federal service, at least 18 months of which must have been served subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(4) If he has completed 10 years but less than 15 years of satisfactory Federal service in any or all of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 4 years of active Federal service, at least 1 year of which must have been served subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(5) If he has completed 15 years, but less than 20 years of satisfactory Federal service in any or all of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 4 years of active Federal service, at least 6 months of which must have been served subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(6) If he has completed 20 or more years of satisfactory Federal service in any or all of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 4 years of active Federal service.

(b) Applications for retirement with pay under this section shall be submitted to the Secretary of the service in which the major portion of the applicant's aggregate service has been accumulated.

(c) Any person who, upon attaining the age of 60 years, has qualified for retirement with pay pursuant to this title, may, by order of the cognizant Secretary, be retained on duty to perform Federal service. Any person so retained shall be credited with equivalent periods of Federal service for the performance of such duties.

Sec. 303. Any person granted retired pay pursuant to the provisions of this title shall receive such pay at an annual rate equal to—

(1) two and one-half percent of the active-duty annual base and longevity pay which he would receive if serving, at the time granted such pay, on active duty in the highest grade, temporary or permanent, satisfactorily held by him during his entire period of service, multiplied by a number equal to the sum of the number of years of his active Federal service; and

(2) one-half of 1 percent of such active-duty annual base and longevity pay multiplied by a number equal to the sum of the number of years of his Federal service other than active Federal service:

Provided, That no person shall be entitled to receive such retired pay at an annual rate in excess of 75 percent of said active-duty pay: *Provided further*, That in computing the number of years of Federal service for the purposes of computing retirement pay

under provisions of this title, a fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or less shall be disregarded and a fraction of more than 6 months counted as 1 year.

Sec. 304. (a) The Secretary of War with respect to personnel of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, shall determine what constitutes, or has constituted, satisfactory Federal service other than active Federal service for the purposes of this title. After the effective date of this title and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, any member of a Reserve component of either the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, or the United States Marine Corps who, in the opinion of the cognizant Secretary, fails to conform to such standards and qualifications as may be prescribed by law or regulations may, at any time, by order of the cognizant Secretary, be placed in an inactive status for the purposes of this title, or be discharged from any such component.

Sec. 305. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable to any officer or enlisted person of the regular or reserve components of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who is entitled to receive, or is receiving, retired pay under any other provision of law, including pay as a transferred member of the Fleet Reserve.

Sec. 306. For the purposes of this title—

(a) The term "Federal service" shall be deemed to mean all active Federal service and all Federal service other than active Federal duty, or both.

(b) Service in a "reserve component" as used in this title includes service in—

(1) the National Guard of the United States;

(2) the National Guard while in the service of the United States;

(3) the federally recognized National Guard prior to 1933;

(4) a federally recognized status in the National Guard prior to 1933;

(5) the Officers' Reserve Corps;

(6) the Enlisted Reserve Corps;

(7) the Army of the United States without component;

(8) the Naval Reserve, including the Organized Naval Reserve, the Volunteer Naval Reserve, the Merchant Marine Reserve of the Naval Reserve;

(9) the Marine Corps Reserve, including the Organized Marine Corps Reserve, and the Volunteer Marine Corps Reserve; and

(10) the Naval Militia in the Naval Reserve.

(c) The term "active Federal service" shall include all periods of annual training duty and all prescribed periods of attendance at such service schools as have been, or may be designated as such by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for their respective services, or by law.

(d) With respect to personnel of the Army, service in the inactive National Guard, in a nonfederally recognized status in the National Guard, or in the inactive Reserve section of the Officers' Reserve Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal service.

Sec. 307. After the effective date of this title, any member of a reserve component of the Army of the United States, the Organized Naval or Marine Corps Reserve, the Volunteer Naval or Marine Corps Reserve, or the Merchant Marine Reserve of the Naval Reserve, who, with the approval of the cognizant service secretary, satisfactorily completes such drills or other training as may be prescribed for said components by the cognizant service secretaries thereof, shall be granted the equivalent of 30 days of active Federal service for the purpose of determining eligibility for retirement only pursuant to the provisions of section 302.

Sec. 308. The Secretary of War with respect to personnel of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to per-

sonnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, are authorized to prescribe such rules, regulations, and procedures as they may deem necessary to effectuate the provisions of this title.

Sec. 309. Any person who has not attained the age of 60 years but is eligible in all other respects to receive retired pay under the provisions of this title may, at his own request and in the discretion of the Secretary of the cognizant service be transferred to such inactive status list as has been, or may be established by law or regulation for the reserve components of the Army of the United States, Navy, or Marine Corps. After the effective date of such transfer he shall not be required to participate in any training or other program prescribed for said reserve components, and he shall not be entitled to be credited with either active Federal service or Federal service other than active Federal service for the purposes of this title while his name is on said inactive status list. Any such person may, in the discretion of the cognizant service Secretary, be recalled to duty from said list at any time, and if so recalled he shall be credited with equivalent periods of active Federal service or Federal service other than active Federal service for purposes of this title.

Sec. 310. (a) The Secretary of War with respect to personnel of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps shall certify and submit to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for payment, the names of all persons entitled to receive retired pay under the provisions of this title, along with a statement as to the amount of such pay to which said persons are entitled. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall, thereafter, disburse such pay to said persons from appropriations made to the Veterans' Administration for that purpose.

Sec. 311. No back pay or allowances for any period prior to the date of enactment thereof shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this title.

Sec. 312. The provisions of this title, except as may be necessary to adapt the same thereto shall apply to personnel of the Coast Guard Reserve in relationship to the Coast Guard in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to personnel of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve in relationship to the Navy: *Provided*, That wherever authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy, similar authority shall be deemed to be given to the Secretary of the Treasury to be exercised with respect to the Coast Guard except at such time or times as the Coast Guard may be operating under the Secretary of the Navy.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the committee has three substantive amendments, which are on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. Chairman, I offer the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: That section 204 (a) of the bill be amended by striking out the last sentence of said section.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: That section 204 (b) of the bill be amended by striking out the last sentence of said section.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: That section 205 (b) of the bill be amended by striking therefrom the last sentence in said section.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all the amendments in the printed report which refer to lines and pages of the original bill be considered en bloc. They are merely technical perfecting amendments.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Does the unanimous-consent request just made refer to the amendment on page 4, line 15, down to the bottom of the page?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It does, but if the gentleman wishes to reserve an objection to that particular amendment I have no objection to it. I understand the gentleman wishes to offer an amendment to that amendment but I would like to ask unanimous consent that all of the other amendments shown upon the report, with the exception of the one mentioned by the gentleman from Oregon may be considered and adopted en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in order to clarify my position, I would like to offer an amendment to the committee amendment which, in the report reads as follows:

Page 4, lines 15 to 18, strike out the present subsection (a) in its entirety and substitute in lieu thereof a new subsection to read as follows—

And then follows the language. My amendment will be offered to that committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have an opportunity to offer that amendment if the request is granted.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Would it be in order to offer that amendment at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to dispose of the committee amendments first, to which there is no objection.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] that the amendments shown in the report, with the exception of the amendment referred to by the gentleman from Oregon, be considered en bloc and agreed to?

There was no objection.

The amendments referred to were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment which was not acted upon.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 4, line 16, strike out all of line 16 down to and including line 19 and insert:

"(a) if on the date of removal he is eligible for voluntary retirement under any provision of law then in effect, he shall be retired in the grade and with the retired pay to which he would be entitled if he were retired upon his own application."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLSWORTH: Page 4, line 24, substitute a colon for the semicolon and insert the following proviso: "Provided, That each officer of the Regular Army, heretofore involuntarily retired under the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), if on the date of removal he was eligible for voluntary retirement under any provision of law then in effect, he shall be placed upon the retired list in the grade and with the retired pay and other benefits to which he would be entitled if he had been retired upon his own application. Such change shall be effective from the date of such retirement."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the members of the Military Affairs Committee will recall that this amendment to the committee amendment is the substance of an amendment which I proposed at the hearings on the bill. I believe the committee and the War Department representatives agreed at that time that it was inequitable to grant greater benefits to an officer who retired voluntarily than to an officer who had a good record and defended himself and was later retired involuntarily.

The committee amendment corrects the condition for the future, but it does not clearly rectify the errors of the past made and admitted by the War Department. Those errors were admitted in the hearings which I attended in the committee of the other body of this Congress. I do not feel that the committee amendment takes care of that situation. Those who were retired under Public Law 190 of the Seventy-seventh Congress were not granted equally in their retirement benefits existing prior to that time and proposed in the terms of this bill.

General Paul, testifying before the committee, page 3618 of the hearings, stated as follows:

The effect of his amendment—

Referring to my amendment—

would be to grant to officers removed from the active list under Public Law 190 benefits, rights, and privileges which would have accrued or will accrue to those officers had they been retired on their own application. The War Department is not opposed to the intent expressed in Mr. Ellsworth's amendment.

As I pointed out earlier, it was the practice, at least in several instances, to notify an officer that he was about to be dismissed and invite him to retire voluntarily. If he would agree to retire voluntarily he was given everything he was entitled to, with his present grade and rate and pay and so on. If he refused to retire voluntarily and insisted on doing what any red-blooded American citizen would do, demand to be shown why he was considered unfit; in other words, if he elected to fight the retirement proceedings, then he was penalized when the Board had finished with his case.

In the case of the two officers I mentioned, one would have had 75 percent of his pay had he voluntarily retired, but

when he fought his case he was retired at 40 percent. The other was reduced in grade.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Did not the men at that time make a selection of their own will? They were not acting under duress, were they?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. They were acting under duress to this extent: They were given 3 days' notice that they were to be called before the board to answer whether or not they would take voluntary retirement. That is a pretty short time for a man to make up his mind on such an important point, and then if he elected not to take voluntary retirement but wanted to know why he was being dismissed from the Army, as any good fighting man should want to know, he was allowed only 14 days under the War Department regulations under Public Law 190 to assemble his witnesses, his affidavits, and any other papers which might be needed to support his opinion; and bear in mind that throughout the whole proceedings he was not allowed to see his own 201 file in the War Department and he did not know when he went to defend himself what he might be charged with. So I think the word "duress" might well be used in describing those proceedings.

My amendment would merely take care of a very few cases of men who were retired involuntarily by the board after making this appearance under these conditions, about a dozen such men who could and should have been retired with greater benefits and sometimes higher rank if they had taken voluntary retirement. What my amendment does is to place those men—very few of them—in a position where justice can be done. Justice, you know, cannot be measured by volume, it cannot be measured in quantity. If we have done an injustice to one man we should correct it; and I know of my own knowledge that the War Department has done injustice to at least two men. The adoption of this amendment would take care of these two or three, or maybe a dozen, cases in which I feel that injustice has been done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and in doing so I wish to point out to the Chairman and members of the Committee what a job the Army did in respect to the enforcement of Public Law 190 to which reference is made in the Ellsworth amendment. General Paul, testifying before the subcommittee, page 3445 of the hearings, said this:

Under Public 190, 239 cases were initiated; 42 were acted upon by the Board.

I might say of the 42 mentioned, since General Paul testified, the number has been reduced by review to 36 cases that were actually acted upon out of the whole United States Army by the Board under Public Law 190.

One hundred and thirty-seven men retired voluntarily. In other words, in these instances when the cases were initiated the officers felt they did not want

to present their cases to the Board because they felt in advance that they could not measure up to the standards required by the Army as we were approaching war. They voluntarily retired rather than face the hearing. In these initiated cases, 38 were retired for physical disability. This shows that the Army went over every case and physically examined the men against whom proceedings had been initiated, and if they found that they were subject to retirement for physical disability, retired them for that reason rather than put them through proceedings under 190. In addition to that, there were seven in the Philippines who were caught out there. Those cases were dropped and were not pressed any further. There are nine others that were dropped by the Board as not being justified. Six resigned for the good of the service or were tried. Actually about 42 cases had to be reviewed. As I say, since then that number has been reduced to 36. In all, only 36 cases of officers were acted upon by the Board and the Board found that they were substandard; and in the face of approaching war, they were released and removed from active service.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the able gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I believe the gentleman understands my point and that is there were a few officers who, had they taken voluntary retirement, would have fared much better on a retired basis than they are now faring, having opposed the Board. Is that not true?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, it might be. I may say that there was only one man in the group that was in service in the Second World War. I may say further that the Army feels that it was abundantly careful in not mistreating any officer and that it did give every officer a break in the proceedings under 190.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that we considered the point that the gentleman from Oregon is making and upon a full and fair consideration of the whole matter we determined we would not allow the amendment? I feel we are bound by the committee's action and by the fact that the whole committee approved our subcommittee action.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Is it not true also that the committee realized that if the present amendment were adopted it would serve to reopen the entire question?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct, and I may say to the gentleman that it might throw the whole proceedings open to other groups who might feel that they themselves have been processed unfairly as long as 20 years before. They might feel that they ought to come in and have their cases reopened and be given the benefits of a more beneficent statute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: Page 10, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946" and insert in lieu thereof "during any war."

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply extends the same privilege to the retired commissioned officers of the Spanish-American War and World War I, that it gives to the retired, commissioned officers of World War II. I am a firm believer in equality for equal service. I believe the services rendered by the retired, commissioned officers of the Spanish-American War, and World War I, were just as meritorious as those of World War II. Of course, there was a different method of warfare between these wars, and those of World War II were more destructive than those of World War I, but as far as the commissioned officers were concerned, the hardships were the same.

I shall offer a similar amendment for the retired warrant officers of the Spanish-American War and World War I, on page 11. I feel that these warrant officers of the Spanish-American War, and World War I are just as much entitled to the benefits of this legislation as those of World War II. Here again I say I believe in equality of treatment, and there is no just reason for a difference of treatment.

I shall offer a similar amendment on page 12 for the retired enlisted men of the Regular Army of the Spanish-American War and World War I. Surely there is neither logic nor justice in making a difference. These men are all entitled to equal treatment, and equal appreciation at the hands of the Nation which they were willing to defend on foreign battlefields.

Again, there is no logic for treating the retired enlisted men of World War II any more favorably than those of the Spanish-American War and World War I. Simple justice demands that we treat them all alike. These small amendments will not, in any way, affect the provisions of this bill except to extend it to men who are equally entitled to our consideration.

I feel that the present pay for all of these men is inadequate under the American standard of living. These men are not able to take care of themselves and their dependents with the present 30-cent dollar. The cost of living, as far as food is concerned, has gone up at least 200 percent, if not more, since 1937, 1938, and 1939.

For example, on August 11, 1939, in Fargo, N. Dak., a pound of Land O'Lakes butter was 23 cents; eggs were 2 dozen for 23 cents, strictly fresh; a pound

and a half loaf of bread was 9 cents; pork loin 12 cents; bacon 12½ cents; spare ribs 8 cents; crisp celery 5 cents; two heads of lettuce 13 cents; five bunches of radishes 5 cents; three bunches of carrots 10 cents; three pounds of coffee 39 cents; and other food and articles and wearing apparel were on a par with these prices. Compare them with today's prices.

In addition, may I suggest that since we have, directly or indirectly, given to foreign nations something like \$27,000,000,000 since the war ended, and we are considering giving them another \$17,000,000,000, it is about time that we take care of our own retired armed forces. It is about time that we take care of those who were willing and whose duty it was to defend our Nation in time of danger. Charity still begins at home.

H. R. 2744 is unfair to retired officers who served overseas and in combat in World War I. Many of these will continue to receive the pay of retired enlisted men notwithstanding their heroic combat service, inasmuch as World War I officers and enlisted men are entirely ignored in the provisions of H. R. 2744.

It is unfair to single out for special favor the officers of World War II, and to grant them pay of their highest rank after 20 years service, while at the same time those who served at higher rank in World War I, and who retired after 30 years service are ignored. There is neither justice nor sense to such procedure. I repeat, let us treat them all alike.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to extend their remarks in favor of this amendment may do so at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all of us on the committee are appreciative of the services rendered by the veterans of the Spanish-American War and the First World War. However, the amendment that is now offered would, in my opinion, disjoint and upset this bill. The reason we provided retirement pay for officers at their highest temporary rank was that the Congress itself, either the Seventy-eighth or the Seventy-ninth Congress, passed a law giving that privilege to naval officers. We felt that the Army officers serving in the Second World War should be on a parity with the officers of the Navy. When I say "officers of the Army" I include officers of the Air Force. If we open the door and go clear back to 1898 we shall have to do the same thing with the Navy, and there will be no end to it. As far as the officers of the Spanish-American War are concerned, I am of the opinion that there were no temporary ranks in that war, but there were a few

temporary ranks in World War I. I believe I know of one of them. Lt. Gen. Hunter Liggett, I think, had a temporary rank.

At any rate, the reason we are opposing the amendment is that after giving full consideration to the evidence that was offered to us the subcommittee and the entire committee decided unanimously that we were just bringing the officers of the Second World War on a parity with the Navy officers in their right to retirement, and we did not want to extend the principle any further.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I concur with what the gentleman has said. I should like to go just a little further and say that the gentleman's amendment will actually not be fair to all of the veterans of past wars. As the gentleman has indicated, it will not cover the Navy or the Marine Corps in the past wars. It will do exactly the reverse of what the gentleman has in mind. He has in mind doing justice uniformly to all. This will do the reverse. This title in its totality just covers the men of the Army. His amendment would simply cover the men of the Army in past wars, leaving out the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. For the reasons stated by myself and my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], Mr. Chairman, we respectfully request the Committee to reject the amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The situation is simply this. After the First World War we realized that there was something owed to those men who had been, in most instances, enlisted men of the Regular service for a period of many years. When that war came on, their ability and experience was utilized by commissioning them. They served ordinarily as lieutenants, captains, and majors. They are a relatively small number. I think most of them are now retired. They were fine old soldiers, and the Congress recognized their service, what they had done for the Nation, by permitting all of them to retire with the pay of warrant officers and with the honorary title of the rank which they held while serving as officers. So we have the anomalous situation of men who served in the First World War, old soldiers, fine soldiers, who did a wonderful job, having the honorary title of the rank in which they served and drawing the pay of a warrant officer.

Those are the principal people who would be affected by this amendment. We recognize that they were entitled to something after the First World War, and I think we did a very poor job of it when we gave them the honorary title of the rank they held and the pay of a

warrant officer. You now recognize after the Second World War that the people who served in the higher commissioned ranks, those who had come from the ranks, are entitled to retire in the highest rank satisfactorily held. There are very few of these men. They served well and faithfully many years ago. They are asking now that they get simply what quite evidently the committee thinks the men of the Second World War are entitled to, and I think it should be extended to those of the First World War. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman any idea how many officers it will involve?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know. I cannot tell you.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of this amendment is to treat all alike, is that not right?

Mr. KILDAY. That is right. The bill proposed by the committee does exactly that for those who served in World War II, and the amendment would do the same for those who served in World War I. The gentleman from North Dakota says that it would cover the Spanish-American War. I doubt if there are any of those left.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that the amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota only provides benefits for Army officers, and then you would open the door to Navy officers?

Mr. KILDAY. I have spent 10 years here trying to keep the Army up with the Navy, and you know as well as I do from the time that we have served on the committee we have always been attempting to get equality between the Army and the Navy. You bring this bill in now in order to bring the Army up to the Navy, and then you say the gentleman's amendment would put the Army ahead of the Navy. I had given up hope of ever getting them equalized.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What I am afraid of is that it would disjoint the bill, and then we would have to pass another bill to bring the Navy up to the level of the World War I veterans.

Mr. KILDAY. You and I were on the Committee on Military Affairs. The Committee on Naval Affairs reported out a bill under which the Navy has what you are now giving the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is right.

Mr. KILDAY. It is just too bad about this thing that it is so out of joint. But we cannot help it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the amendment would take care of those officers who are retired, and under the law were given an additional rank upon retirement? Is the purpose of the gentleman's amendment

to take care of such groups? I think all of the officers were given additional honorary rank on retirement.

Mr. KILDAY. No; I do not think that would be the construction. It says the highest rank satisfactorily held. As I understand the administration of the Navy retirement, many men who served in a higher rank did not retire at that higher rank, because it was held that they did not satisfactorily serve in that rank. In other words, their efficiency index was below the average of the men in that type of service.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it the purpose of this amendment, at least so far as the Army is concerned, to cover those who served in any way in the past?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that is that they should come within the purview of the provisions of this bill if it becomes law and give them the same consideration as was given to World War II officers?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. If that throws the Navy out of gear, after this amendment is adopted they can take care of that in the other body very easily.

Mr. KILDAY. I would say that you never need to worry about the Navy taking care of itself. The principal argument for this provision today is that they want to get the Army up on an equal level with what the Navy already has. I think if you just leave the Navy alone, they will take care of themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that I shall vote for the amendment in spite of the argument of my valued friend from North Dakota, which I do not think was at all pertinent to the issue except on the question of equity.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to say briefly that we held extensive hearings which ran over a long period of time, as is indicated by the record. There is not a great deal in the hearings to show how much this amendment would cost, how many men it would cover, and what the possible effect would be.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman might refer to page 3542 of the hearings. There is a statement of the number of people involved in this amendment. There are 500 persons involved, ranking from second lieutenant to lieutenant colonel, and the increased cost, if they receive retirement at their highest temporary rank, would be \$480,450.72 per year. I want the RECORD to show that the total cost at the present time under their current retirement at their permanent grades is \$1,215,000, and that would be raised by \$480,000 if we put them at their temporary highest rank.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. May I also ask what it would cost to put World War II in this bill? If you are figuring patriotism in

dollars and cents, let us figure it from all angles.

Mr. BROOKS. Title II would cost, roughly, \$5,000,000. That was discussed in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of making inquiry.

I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] and my curiosity was acutely aroused when I heard him say this would apply to Spanish-American War veterans. Perhaps I am the only person present who can qualify in that category. How far does this go in going back and picking up people who served in the Army? I gathered the impression it would take in the Spanish-American War veterans. What types of service are to be regarded as incurring eligibility?

Mr. BROOKS. I would assume his amendment would go all the way back to the Civil War veterans. I doubt if it would cover Confederate veterans, but it would take in the Civil War veterans.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does it cover only people who were retired following those wars?

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman knows the amendment as well as I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It only applies to retired members of the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then a member of the Army who was retired in 1899 under the then existing law and received benefits would be picked up by this amendment, would he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If he were retired at a permanent rank and he had a higher rank which was temporary, then he would go to the highest rank that he held temporarily.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot remember at this moment whether there were any temporary ranks or not. I doubt it. Does it cover the Philippine insurrection?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My idea is it would cover any military service in the Army of the United States, no matter when.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It applies to persons who were not in the Regular Army?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; that is the Reserve components.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The best I can say is that you are exploring a very wide field. I do not know where you will end.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Of course the increase would only take effect after the adoption of the present law. It would not be retroactive.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. I realize, of course, that we can visualize many things happening with reference to someone who retired in 1899, for instance, but there are only 500 people affected by this, at a total of \$400,000 a year, whereas the present bill authorizes \$5,000,000 a year for a much larger number of people who have retired out of the Second World War.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman assure me that the 500 whom he says are eligible for benefits con-

templated in this amendment are all World War I veterans?

Mr. KILDAY. I was not a member of the subcommittee and I do not have the complete details. I am relying entirely on the remarks made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who just read from the hearings that there were 500 who would be affected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is in World War I?

Mr. KILDAY. No. I think that is the total, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No. That is only for World War I.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I thought so. It would go beyond 500.

Mr. KILDAY. As you say, you are probably the only veteran of the Spanish-American War here. The same ratio would probably hold true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did not hold a commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of asking the chairman a question.

The wording of this amendment is "During any war." Is that a wording which is found in other statutes? It seems to me it would perhaps open up possibilities which we do not contemplate at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What page is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. KEATING. I am referring to the amendment itself that has been offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We do not use that phrase in our act, but it would apply to any war hereafter if we should have one which I hope we will not; but I presume he wanted to be all-inclusive and include officers of the invasion of Mexico and the Spanish-American War and World War I and possibly some of our incursions into Asia.

Mr. KEATING. It seemed to me it was open to that criticism also. That is why I raised the question.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. I may suggest to the gentleman that that expression appears in many of our statutes, "in any war," but it does not appear in this particular act.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Does not the gentleman recognize the fact that a war can only be one declared by Congress? When you say "in any war" you are referring not to the landing of the Marines in Nicaragua or something of that kind where war was not declared, but you are referring only to a war under the Constitution declared by act of Congress.

Mr. KEATING. I am assuming that the gentleman from North Dakota referred to a war declared by this country; but it does not say so in his amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. I did not write the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

What appeals to me in this amendment is the question of justice. I was not an officer in World War I, I was an enlisted man, but men who served as officers in World War I and the Spanish American War—certainly we cannot go back to the Civil War because there are very few Civil War veterans left. For all practical purposes the Civil War is over; and even the survivors of the Spanish-American War find their ranks thinning rapidly.

The testimony shows a little over 500 World War I. What does this section provide:

Each commissioned officer of the Regular Army heretofore or hereafter retired under any provision of the law shall be advanced on the officers' retired list to the highest temporary grade satisfactorily held by him during any war.

That covers World War II. And—

It shall include the period from September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946.

I can see the necessity for that because the date, September 9, 1940, precedes our actual and official declaration of war. That is a matter that can be taken care of very easily.

The thing that impresses me is the question of justice here. That is one thing that I want to try to approximate, a little human justice. If there are any World War I veterans, yes, if there are any Spanish American War veterans who were officers, who held a higher temporary grade than that under which they were retired they should be included in this provision of the bill. It seems to me to be a matter of elementary justice.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is a great deal to the gentleman's argument, but it seems to me he made a suggestion a short time ago that would be better. Why not submit this to the other body and let them do the job over there? We had very thorough hearings on this, and we finally concluded that the best thing to do was to advance those of World War II to retirement at their highest temporary rank because of the one fact only, that the Congress of the United States had granted the same right to the Navy and we ought to put the two services on a parity. Now we dig into another war and take care of only one third of the group.

If we write this bill on the floor it will unbalance the measure and have to be rewritten over on the other side.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose it should not be placed in the bill on the other side? If we put it in on this side at least the amendment will be in conference.

The gentleman admits that there is a case of justice here. My friend admits that there are World War I officers who are unconsciously being discriminated against. I say it is unconscious, unintentional, but why allow that to happen? That condition should not exist.

If a World War I officer held a temporary rank higher than the grade he is now getting retirement pay on, we ought to give him the benefit of the provisions of this bill. It seems to me that is a matter of justice.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to make one comment and I do not want the gentleman to think I am unfair.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot conceive of the gentleman being unfair, because he is one Member of the House for whom I have a very high regard, particularly when it comes to the element of fairness. That is not involved in any discussion between the gentleman and myself.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman. I want to make the comment that the average service in World War II was about twice as much as the average service in World War I. The gentleman remembers that he and I served approximately 2 years. Many of these men served from 2½ to 5½ years in the recent war. As the gentleman will remember, we took them in in 1940 when the Wadsworth Act was passed. We began to take in Reserve officers and so forth, including National Guard officers, and most of those men stayed in for the duration of the war which came to a conclusion late in 1945. Many men were not demobilized until 1946. That was one of the elements that we thought about when we tried to put them on a parity with the Navy.

Mr. McCORMACK. In any event, it is a matter of justice which calls for some action being taken. I shall vote for the pending amendment and if it is not adopted by this body I hope the other body will consider it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 27, noes 38.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: On page 11, lines 16 and 17, strike out the words "during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946" and insert in lieu thereof "during any war."

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, this is simply along the same line as the amendment we have just voted upon and fully discussed. I have no further remarks to make on the particular amendment except to repeat what I said in reference to the first one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: Page 12, lines 20 and 21, strike out the words "during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946" and insert in lieu thereof "during any war."

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, the argument for this amendment is identical with that I offered for the other amendments and I shall not take the time to repeat them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: title II, page 14, line 14, add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 206 (a) All retired Army officers below the grade of colonel who have served in time of war drawing retired pay based upon the pay of an officer of the next higher grade shall be advanced one grade on the retired list, the advancement involving no increased retired pay.

"(b) Any retired officer of the Army who (1) has been specially commended for his performance of duty in action or combat by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction said duty was performed, or (2) has received from the United States a medal, citation, or decoration for gallantry or conduct in action against an enemy or has been awarded the Purple Heart Medal for having been wounded in action or combat with the enemy, shall be advanced one grade on the retired list. A retired officer entitled to advancement on the retired list under the provisions of this section shall not be deprived of such advancement by virtue of the fact that he is advanced under the provisions of the first section of this act, this advancement involving no increased retired pay."

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment involves absolutely no expense, and would promote retired Army officers who already draw the pay of the next rank, and who were not promoted, in general, due to the fact that although they had served the required time there were not sufficient vacancies, or the laws in effect now were not in effect at the time of their service, but this amendment has the additional requirement that they be veterans of a war.

It also provides for the advancement of Army officers who hold medals or were specially commended in action or combat against the enemy. In 1942, Public Laws 464 and 597 of the Seventy-seventh Congress granted this privilege to the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey. There is no reason why we should not be consistent and do for the Army what we have already done for all the other branches of the service, especially in view of the merger of the services.

This needed amendment will help the low morale in the Army brought about by the long-existing discrimination.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Did the gentleman present this amendment to our committee?

Mr. LEMKE. I have introduced bills for years before the gentleman's committee, but about the only bills that that committee considers are those that the Army and the Navy bring in, I am sorry to say. But, that has been my experience during the years.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We heard dozens and dozens of bills, and if the gentleman had come up there personally with a witness and presented the matter, we would have given him a fair hearing.

Mr. LEMKE. I appreciate that, and I shall certainly take advantage of that if that is the attitude of the subcommit-

tee. But, I have not fared so well with your committee in connection with these matters. As a matter of fact, I am not criticizing the committee, its jurisdiction and its province, but I have had quite a number of bills before that committee in recent years. Some have been there 3 or 4 years; in fact, I think more than that, and I have never gotten any real action on them. I have always reintroduced a lot of them with each new session of Congress, and I feel that the only way we can get a hearing on these matters is before the Congress as a whole. But, hereafter, if I am informed that any of my bills are before your committee, you will certainly find me present to present arguments in favor of the bills. I thank the gentleman for his fairness in making that suggestion and giving me at least a faint ray of hope that in the future I will be successful in being heard before that committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to take this time of the Committee, but I feel that our committee will have to resist this amendment because we have had no hearings on it, and it is dangerous to write amendments of this kind on the floor of the House.

I do not know whether the men in the Navy received advances in rank on account of medals. I am one of those who think that is bad practice. I was lucky enough to get two medals in the First World War, and I believe there are hundreds of men that never were decorated because the right person did not see them do something. I do not know why we should pick out those of us that happened to be lucky and give us some extra emoluments or honors or rank. I do not think the system is a good one, myself. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think it should be pointed out that the services were very liberal in their promotion policies during World War II. I think the gentleman will find that practically every man who was wounded or decorated received at least one promotion during his service. Aside from that, I think it would be ill-advised to attempt to establish a blanket policy such as is outlined here. The gentleman from North Dakota did have an opportunity to come before the committee. The chairman was very generous in asking Members to come before the committee and express themselves on any point in connection with this program. The point was not raised, but I have serious doubts that this matter is even germane to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I appreciate the gentleman's comment. May I add that practically every man who left the Army of the United States got a promotion in rank. As he left the service he was promoted one grade.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that that applied to the Army but did not apply to the Navy, so this might be a case where the Navy would be entitled to some additional consideration in the way of promotion where the Army would not, because of that very fact?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know about the Navy, but I know that in the Army practically every man with a good record got one jump up in rank as he left the service.

Mr. KEATING. Automatically.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; and that applied to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am sorry, I did not qualify for that because it applied only to those below the rank of colonel.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the gentleman is a little in error about the promotion based on service. I think it was based on having served 30 months in one grade. When a man left after having served 30 months in one grade, he was promoted.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There were several different categories. That was one of them. I think there were other categories besides that to get promotions.

Mr. JAVITS. That happened to me. That is why I say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It was entirely different in World War I. We got nothing in the way of promotions as we left the Army and as a matter of fact did not expect anything. The fact that we came out alive and in good health was enough reward.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further committee amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, we have more committee amendments, and I should like to make this brief explanation before I offer them. Two acts were passed after the present bill was reported out of the committee, the Unification Act and the Personnel Act. This required the complete revision of the bill and the drafting of technical amendments to protect this bill. A group of these amendments are on the Clerk's desk in a list marked AA, meaning amendments to amendments. They are all perfecting amendments. I ask unanimous consent that all the amendments at the Clerk's desk marked AA be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the figure "1947" and substitute in lieu thereof the figure "1948."

Page 17, line 25, strike out the colon and add the following: "except that any member of a reserve component of the Air Force of the United States shall be entitled to in-

clude service as a member of a reserve component of the Army of the United States performed on or prior to July 26, 1949."

(NOTE.—This amendment is necessary in order to protect the rights of members of the reserve components of the Air Force; otherwise they would be prejudiced by the requirement that the last 8 years of service for eligibility purposes must have been in a reserve component of the service to which application is made for retirement. Obviously this would be impossible of fulfillment by any member of the Air Force reserve components until the separate Air Force has been in existence for 8 years. However, in view of the fact that it would be undesirable to permit indiscriminate transfers between the Army and Air Force reserve components for an indefinite period in the future, the date July 26, 1949 has been selected as a limiting date because the Unification Act provides that the completion of the separation of the Army and Air Force shall be effective as of a date 2 years after the effective date of that act. The effective date of the Unification Act was July 26, 1947.)

Page 18, line 3, after the comma following the word "Navy" insert the words "Air Force."

Page 20, line 7, strike out the word "either."

Page 20, line 8, after the comma following the words "United States", insert the words "the Air Force of the United States."

Page 20, line 9, strike out the word "War" and the comma immediately thereafter and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

Page 20, line 10, strike out the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof a comma.

Page 20, line 12, strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof the words "and by the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to personnel of the Air Force."

Page 21, line 8, after the comma following the word "Navy", insert the words "Air Force."

Page 24, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and add the following:

"(13) the Air National Guard;

"(14) the Air Force Reserve (Officers or Enlisted sections);

"(15) the Air Force of the United States without component."

Page 25, line 7, after the word "States", strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof the words "or the Air Force of the United States, or any member of."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer some further amendments, which are at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "Army", insert the words "and Air Force."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "War is" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, for their respective services, are."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the words "as may be satisfactory to him" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "as each may deem satisfactory."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force, as the case may be."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the words "War shall" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force shall, for their respective services, each."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force, as the case may be."

Page 2, line 11, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "cognizant Secretary."

Page 2, line 19, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "cognizant Secretary."

Page 3, line 7, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "cognizant Secretary."

Page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "cognizant Secretary."

Page 3, line 20, strike out the word "War" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be."

Page 3, line 25, and page 4, line 1, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "cognizant Secretary."

Page 4, line 15, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 6, line 3, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, for their respective services."

Page 6, line 5, after the word "Army", insert "or the Regular Air Force, as the case may be."

Page 6, line 15, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as appropriate."

Page 6, line 20, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force."

Page 6, line 22, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 7, line 1, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force, as the case may be."

Page 7, line 4, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, for their respective services."

Page 7, line 5, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "cognizant Secretary."

Page 7, line 12, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 7, line 14, strike out the words "Regular Army" and insert in lieu thereof the words "service concerned."

Page 7, line 24, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force."

Page 8, line 1, before the word "such", insert the words "for their respective services."

Page 8, line 12, after the word "Army", insert the words "and the Regular Air Force."

Page 8, line 14, strike out the words "War shall" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each."

Page 8, line 14, after the word "establish", insert the words "for their respective services."

Page 8, line 15, strike out the words "Army Register" and insert in lieu thereof the words "official Register of the service concerned."

Page 8, line 17, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force, as the case may be."

Page 8, line 21, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 8, line 24, strike out the parentheses and the letter "a" contained therein.

Page 9, line 4, after the word "Army", insert a comma followed by the words "the Regular Air Force."

Page 9, line 6, after the word "States", insert the words "or of the Air Force of the United States."

Page 9, lines 9 and 10, strike out the word "commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof the word "commissioned."

Page 9, line 11, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be."

Page 10, lines 1 to 4, strike out in its entirety the present subsection (b) (NOTE.—This repealer is no longer necessary as the proviso which it seeks to repeal has already been repealed by section 514 (g) (2) of the

Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (promotion bill), act of August 7, 1947, Public Law 381 of the 80th Cong.).

Page 10, line 6, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 10, line 10, after the words "on the" insert the word "applicable."

Page 10, line 12, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "cognizant Secretary."

Page 10, strike out all of lines 17 and 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) That the second proviso under the heading 'Retired Officers' of the act approved June 12, 1906 (34 Stat. 245; 10 U. S. C. 946) is hereby repealed."

(NOTE.—The effect of the language now contained in the bill would be to repeal the entire act of June 12, 1906. This effect was never intended, the purpose of this provision being merely to repeal the specific proviso referred to in the amendment.)

Page 10, line 24, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, whichever may be concerned."

Page 11, line 16, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "cognizant Secretary."

Page 12, line 8, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

Page 12, line 14, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 12, line 20, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "cognizant Secretary."

Page 13, line 3, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 13, line 13, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 14, line 4, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force."

Page 14, line 5, before the word "such", insert the words "for their respective services."

Page 14, line 18, after the word "States", insert a comma followed by the words "the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States."

Page 14, line 21, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

Page 14, line 22, after the word "List", insert the words "and the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to establish the Air Force of the United States Retired List."

Page 14, line 23, strike out the words "Army Register" and insert in lieu thereof the words "official Register of the service concerned."

Page 14, line 23, after the word "which", insert the word "respectively."

Page 14, line 25, after the word "States", insert the words "or the Air Force of the United States, as the case may be."

Page 15, line 1, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 15, line 7, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 15, line 8, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Regular Air Force."

Page 15, line 11, after the word "States", insert the words "or the Air Force of the United States."

Page 15, line 11, strike out the words "or any component thereof" and insert in lieu thereof the words "or in any of the respective components thereof."

Page 15, line 25, after the word "States", insert the words "or the Air Force of the United States."

Page 15, line 25, after the words "including the", insert the word "respective."

Page 24, line 7, strike out the words "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

Page 24, line 8, after the word "Navy", insert the words "and the Secretary of the Air Force."

Page 24, line 11, after the word "Army", insert the words "or the Air Force."

Page 24, line 12, strike out the comma following the word "Guard" and insert in lieu thereof the words "or Air National Guard."

Page 24, line 13, strike out the comma following the word "Guard" and insert in lieu thereof the words "or Air National Guard."

Page 24, line 14, after the word "Corps" insert the words "or the inactive officers' section of the Air Force Reserve."

Page 25, line 21, strike out the word "War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

Page 25, line 22, strike out the word "and."

Page 25, line 23, strike out the comma after the word "Corps" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to personnel of the Air Force."

Page 26, line 7, after the comma following the word "Navy", insert the words "Air Force of the United States."

Page 27, line 3, strike out the word "War" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

Page 27, line 4, strike out the word "and."

Page 27, line 5, after the word "Corps", insert the words "and the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to personnel of the Air Force."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, these amendments are all of a technical nature, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLSWORTH: On page 6, line 3 strike out the first word of the subsection and insert "immediately following the enactment of this act, the."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides the identical wording used to begin section 102 of the same bill, merely to insure that the act will take effect immediately. That is the only and total effect of the amendment. I hope the Committee will accept it, and that the amendment will be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] may appear in the RECORD during the consideration of the so-called Alaska airport bill during the general debate thereon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the subcommittee in charge of this bill is willing to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLSWORTH: On page 6, line 7, following the words "55 Stat.

606", insert the following: "or who was retired on his own application as an alternative thereof."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment refers to the very few cases of men who were discharged with situations with respect to pay, grade, and rank lower than they would have had if they had retired voluntarily. In other words, they were penalized because they dared to oppose the board or dared to defend themselves. This is different from the amendment previously offered. All this proposes is that those men who feel that they voluntarily retired under duress may now come back to the board, the War Department, and ask that their cases be reviewed. It is simple justice. It does not involve the reopening of any case. It does not do anything but allow a very few men, many of whom have given many years of their lives to the armed forces and who feel deeply injured as the situation now stands, an opportunity to have their cases again disposed of.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Are these the men who come under Public 190?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Only 190.

Mr. BROOKS. This is in effect the same amendment which the committee considered a few moments ago and voted down.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It is not the same amendment. This simply allows the board to consider the men who had voluntarily retired feeling that they had done so under duress.

Mr. BROOKS. It is practically the same amendment.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I do not consider it so.

Mr. BROOKS. It involves the same facts and affects the same men?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No. It merely permits these men who retired voluntarily because they felt themselves under duress to now ask the board to come under the new procedure which this bill sets up and pass on their cases.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I am inclined to go along with this amendment but with this reservation in my own mind with regard to the matter: Long service on the Military Affairs Committee and on the appropriations committee for the Navy makes me feel that no amendment should be made on this floor respecting such matters as this unless they have the approval of the military department which is involved, with respect to the amendment suggested. I would like to know whether the War Department has had any opportunity to consider this matter.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would like to make one more statement with reference to this amendment to the gentleman from Louisiana. The difference between this amendment and the other amendment is that the other amendment sought to restore benefits to those who had been retired involuntarily back to where they would have been had they retired voluntarily. This is the other way around.

This would allow those who retired voluntarily to have their cases reviewed in the event they feel they were not properly treated in the beginning.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Does the proposed amendment have the approval of the Secretary of National Defense?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I could not answer the gentleman on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would like to state to the committee that this is substantially the same amendment that we voted on some time ago and rejected. In the original amendment offered, which the committee rejected, we were to take care of those men who had been retired and removed from the active list. This amendment would take care of those who had come up to the trial and had voluntarily resigned, rather than stand trial. I submit that if we go into this amendment the whole matter ought to be reopened and we ought to review all of the cases heard by the board. Two hundred and thirty-nine of those cases were initiated, and as I said before, 137 voluntarily retired. Thirty-six went to trial and as a result of the trial were removed from the active list. The subcommittee wanted to close the door at some time on these officers found to be substandard and therefore we were against the amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the gentleman should point out that these officers by their own choice decided that they would not have their case argued before a board.

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, the other case where the men were forced into a trial and found to be substandard is stronger than where the man comes up for trial and does not want to face the music. So I think, from the standpoint of the gentleman's amendment, it is a little weaker case than the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising at this time is to call to the attention of the Committee on the Armed Services a situation that I hope will receive early consideration and attention. A few months ago a disabled veteran called in to see me at my office in Boston. He was a first lieutenant in the Naval Air Corps, marine service. He had served throughout the war, having had over 50 missions, was discharged and placed in the Marine Reserves. He was called back to active service for a period of about 6 weeks. After about 15 days after he was called back to active service—and, mark you, he had had about 4 years' service during the war—his name, by the way, is First Lieutenant Finnegan—on August 19, 1947, while landing his Corsair fighter

plane at the termination of a duly scheduled and authorized flight he had a blow-out of one of his tires which capsized the airplane, and in the accident he was injured so badly that it was necessary to amputate his right arm. This unfortunate accident brought to light much to the astonishment of the Reserve marines then on active duty that the retirement and disability benefits currently covering veterans who sustained such injuries were not made available by existing legislation to members of the Reserve who were injured while temporarily on active duty if they have had less than 30 days of service. In other words, had he had active service of more than 30 days and the same accident happened he would be entitled to full benefits. Under the present circumstances all he is entitled to is compensation under the United States employees compensation law.

I realize there are cases where in the consideration of legislation we have to wait until something like this happens before its defects are called to our attention. As a result of this case being called to my attention I introduced a bill which is now before the Committee on the Armed Services which would grant to these Reserves when called back to active service and entitle them to full benefits, whatever might be the duration of the service to such consideration for injury or disability—from the time he is called back into active service.

This is the case, as I said, of a young man who served about 4 years in the Naval Air Corps, then was discharged, went into the Reserves, and was called back to temporary service, and the accident happened about 15 days after he was called back. Because it happened within a period of less than 30 days he is entitled to nothing under the law except the compensation that one receives by reason of the provisions of the United States employees compensation law.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not think the gentleman has stated quite accurately the law as it now exists. The question as to whether he is entitled to retirement would not depend on how long he served but the length of time for which he was called back to duty. If he was called back to duty for a period in excess of 30 days, then he would be entitled to retirement. That was adopted in 1939 and is Public Law 18 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. At that time the old Military Affairs Committee considered whether a man who was called back for, say, his 2 weeks' tour of duty should be entitled to retirement and we came to the conclusion he should not be. That is the manner in which it got into the law. As a matter of fact, it is the only provision of the law under which any temporary officer, whether he be Reserve, National Guard, or whatnot, ever got any retirement. Prior to that time he was entitled to nothing.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct, but in any event this happened about 15 days after he was called back into active service. If he had

been called back for an excess of 30 days' service, he would have been entitled to full benefits.

I hope the Committee on Armed Services will look into this matter with a view to acting favorably on the bill H. R. 5138, which I have introduced.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILLIE: On page 6, line 7, immediately before the words "to a board of review", insert the following: "or pursuant to the provisions of section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act, as amended, provided said retirement or removal was after October 18, 1927."

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, this is a corrective amendment, and I hope the committee will give it serious consideration because it will correct an injustice that has been going on for some time.

Under this bill, H. R. 2744, as it is now before us, section 107 (a) is discriminatory in that it provides for the review of cases of Army officers retired prematurely during World War II when badly needed; that is, those retired under Public Law 190 of 1941, a joint resolution of July 29, 1941, which retirements were carried out in general between December 30, 1941, and May 1, 1942. This review is for the purpose of restoring officers to the active list. Of course, these cases should be reviewed, as well as the cases of the group of officers prematurely retired under the National Defense Act, and in the same manner. Public Law 190 of 1941 simply replaced section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act. However, if relative merit be considered, the officers now covered in section 107 (a) have a stronger claim than those presently covered in the bill, for it was officially determined that the retirement of the National Defense Act officers was not brought about due to neglect, misconduct, or avoidable habits on the part of the officers; that they were retired in time of peace during a period of economy when the War Department was constantly trying to reduce the Army hump caused by taking so many officers in the Army of about the same age, rank, and length of service at one time; and it was thought many of the then officers would not be needed. None of these features applies to the Public Law 190 of 1941 officers. Anyway, both groups should be treated alike.

Of the groups concerned, taking the bill as it now is, not a single officer covered in the bill as now drafted, without this proposed amendment, was recalled to active duty during the past war; whereas in the group left out, but covered by this amendment, there was an officer recalled to active duty who was retired under the National Defense Act. Capt. Edward E. Walker, retired under section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act on January 31, 1932, was recalled to active duty on December 12, 1941, and is, or was, still on active duty when last heard from late in 1947. He certainly made good, for he was promoted and retained on active duty long after many other retired officers, not members of either group, were returned to inactive status. Likewise, others from his

group—the National Defense Act group—had they been given the opportunity, would have made good. Surely you will not refuse to amend this bill so that it would include the right of Major Walker, and others of his group, to have their records reviewed with the possibility of being returned to the active list of the Army should their records justify such action. There is no expense, or funds, involved in this. These officers already receive three-fourths of their active-duty pay. The savings to the Government would depend upon the number returned to duty.

Summing this matter up: The War Department-sponsored section of the bill in one section says, "The Army authorities perhaps erred in prematurely retiring officers at one time who may or may not have served in one world war, so let us have authority to check our rash action in this respect," yet it does not ask for, nor has it so far in this bill received, the right to check its action in prematurely retiring officers at another time—all of whom in the latter case served throughout one world war and some throughout both world wars. This simply does not make sense.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As I understand, all the officers the gentleman refers to are 24 (b) officers, is that correct?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes; that has something to do with the 24 (b) officers.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman is referring to no other group than those, is he?

Mr. GILLIE. That is all, in this one amendment. I have another amendment, but I would like favorable consideration on this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I cannot accept the amendment. I think it would be contrary to the entire idea of the law. Section 24 (b) officers were officers who were tried by a board pursuant to the provisions of section 24 (b) of the National Defense Act. These men had a full hearing of their cases. They had counsel, if they so desired, and they could submit testimony, and they were finally classified as inferior under that statute. Their cases finally went up until they got to the President of the United States—and to show you how poor the procedure was, there were approximately 1,460 officers tried over a 20-year span, and of that number only 238 were eliminated from the Army. We think that they have had their day in court. They have had a full hearing, and Congress, curiously, passed a law placing these men on a retired list, giving them 75 percent of the pay of the rank they held when they were separated from the Army pursuant to this section. This matter was considered thoroughly by our committee and testimony was adduced presenting various viewpoints on the matter, and the subcommittee was unanimous in rejecting the suggestion made by this amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. If this matter is reopened by this amendment, some of these cases tried almost 20 years ago will have to be reconsidered; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILLIE: On page 7, after line 23, add an additional section to title I to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Army shall transmit the name of any officer of the Regular Army, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, who has not less than 15 years' active commissioned service and who is under 58 years of age on the date of the enactment of this act, who was retired after April 26, 1934 (the date of the enactment of the act, Public Law No. 176, Seventy-third Congress, making appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, which limited the number of commissioned officers of the Regular Army and required the premature retirement of some), and before July 1, 1935, now receiving retired pay, unless such retirement was on account of physical disability, to the President, who is authorized and requested to appoint such persons, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate as a commissioned officer on the active list of the Regular Army in the grades and with the seniority which they would have attained by operation of law if they had not been retired and removed therefrom. In the case of any officer who has received a medal, citation, or decoration for gallantry or conduct in action from the United States of America and who was at any time wounded in action and received the Purple Heart, the grade upon return to the retired list shall be the next higher. In determining length of active commissioned service for all purposes of pay, allowances, appointment, promotion, and retirement, each person so restored to the active list of the Regular Army pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be deemed to have served as an officer of the Regular Army on the active list of the Regular Army from the date of his retirement or removal therefrom to the date of his restoration thereon, and upon restoration shall be carried as an additional number in the grade to which restored to the active list or any grade to which he thereafter may be promoted. Each officer so restored shall be accorded all the rights, benefits, and privileges to which he would have been entitled if he had not been removed from the active list of the Army."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I have served in the Reserve Corps since 1925, and I know that the work these officers have done through the years is considerable, and that they have spent an enormous amount of time on it.

This amendment will correct some inequities in connection with this bill.

It would restore to the active list of the Regular Army some 18 officers, who have between 15 and 20 years' active service each, all under retirement age, retired when physically fit, are veterans

of a world war, and now receive three-fourths active-duty pay, who were prematurely retired a few years ago due to lack of funds and Army reduction.

Soon after World War I the War Department took into the regular service several thousand officers, a large number of approximately the same age, rank, and length of service, which created a hump and brought about three large reductions.

Within 15 months after the approval of Public Law 176, Seventy-third Congress, of April 26, 1934, limiting and reducing the number of commissioned officers of the Regular Army, the only specific mandatory reduction, several hundred officers were retired for physical disability.

In 1940, in reply to a question put by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the War Department, in justification of this, stated:

The Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, provided pay for only 11,750 commissioned officers whose commissions were dated prior to June 1, 1934. It was necessary to eliminate the surplus.

There were about 108 slated to be eliminated prematurely who were physically fit. The War Department reversed its decision in 35 cases, and the President, against the advice and recommendation of the War Department, retained 55 on the Army's active list. This was during the era of economy when the Army was trying to smooth out the hump, save money, and accelerate promotions. The reduction brought about the premature retirement of the remaining 18 officers of the original 108. These 18 were physically fit, still under retirement age, but who apparently had neither War Department nor Presidential contacts, and are now receiving 75 percent of their active-duty pay. Although the Army has since been increased from about 12,000 to 50,000 commissioned officers, these 18 officers have not been restored to the active list. In the interest of economy, efficiency, and fairness to the Government and to the individual this should be done at once by including the proposed amendment in this bill. It would save the Government about \$5,000 monthly, and salvage the services of trained officers. These retired officers receive three-fourths active-duty pay and could replace emergency officers who receive full pay on active duty but upon relief would revert to inactive status without pay.

Public Laws 464 and 597, Seventy-seventh Congress, which advance in rank retired officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey upon retirement, provided they were specifically commended in combat, should, of course, apply in this instance.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. Can the gentleman give us the average age of this group?

Mr. GILLIE. I am sorry; I cannot.

Mr. DURHAM. They must be over 50 years of age.

Mr. GILLIE. I would say about 50 years of age.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order, but I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I still question the germaneness of the gentleman's amendment. And, much as I dislike to differ with my distinguished friend from Indiana on any subject, I doubt the wisdom of attempting to attach it to the present bill. The gentleman has offered an amendment which is really a bill in itself. I would not attempt to say that I understand it because I do not but it is a matter of such complexity that I believe it deserves separate consideration and full study by a committee before being brought to the floor of the House for action.

In the main it appears to attempt to restore to active duty or to the active duty list a group of men who obviously are 50 or more years of age. Some of them will be as much as 65 years of age. I wonder where we would put these men on the active-duty rolls. And who they would supersede in rank. I wonder what their duties would be in a military organization with which they long ago lost contact and familiarity. I am afraid an impractical and unworkable situation would result.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Not one word of testimony was heard on this subject before our committee.

Mr. SIKES. That is correct. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLMES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2744) to provide for the selection of elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the utilization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 487, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "To provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard."

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPEALING SECTION 3 (B) OF PUBLIC LAW 395, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 499) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5470) to repeal subsection (b) of section 3 of the act of December 30, 1947. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Con. Res. 155) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That section 3 of the concurrent resolution entitled "Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Housing" (H. Con. Res. 104, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. The committee shall from time to time report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable. The committee shall make a preliminary report not later than March 15, 1948, and shall make its final report not later than June 30, 1948. Reports under this section may be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session."

CONSTRUCTION, PROTECTION, OPERATION OF A PUBLIC AIRPORT IN THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 492 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3510) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

I now yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I will only take a very few minutes to explain this resolution and the bill H. R. 3510 which it makes in order for immediate consideration.

H. R. 3510 provides for the construction of a commercial airport in Alaska in the Anchorage area, for the use of international air traffic and other civilian and commercial traffic, so as to take such traffic away from our military installation at Anchorage.

This new airport proposed for near Anchorage will primarily be a commercial airport, but, of course, in time of national emergency will also be a very, very important part of our national defense.

This is a measure over which there has been no controversy. The bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It has been reported unanimously by the Rules Committee, and I hope both this resolution, making in order the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 3510, and the bill itself will be approved unanimously by the House.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3510) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska, and ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is hereby authorized and directed to construct, protect, operate, and maintain within the Territory of Alaska at such place as he may deem most appropriate a public airport (including all buildings and other structures necessary or desirable therefor) adequate for the needs of the air-transportation services and air commerce of the United States serving the Territory of Alaska and foreign countries by way of points within the Territory of Alaska.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out this act the Administrator is authorized to acquire by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise (including transfer with or without compensation from Federal agencies or the Territory of Alaska or any political subdivision thereof), such lands and appurtenances thereto as may be necessary or desirable for the construction, protection, maintenance, and operation of said airport: *Provided*, That the amount of land so acquired (exclusive of easements and rights-of-way) shall not exceed 5,000 acres.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act the Administrator is empowered to acquire by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise (including transfer with or without compensation from Federal agencies or the Territory of Alaska or any political subdivision thereof), rights-of-way or easements for roads, trails, pipe lines, power lines, railroad spurs, and other similar facilities necessary or desirable for the proper operation of the airport.

SEC. 4. The Administrator shall have control over and responsibility for the care, operation, maintenance, and protection of the airport, together with the power to make and amend such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to the proper exercise thereof: *Provided*, That the authority herein contained may be delegated by the Administrator to such official or officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration within the Territory of Alaska as the Administrator may designate.

SEC. 5. The Administrator is empowered to lease under such conditions as he may deem proper and for such periods as may be desirable (not to exceed 10 years) space or property within or upon the airport for purposes essential or appropriate to the operation of the airport.

SEC. 6. The Administrator is authorized to contract with any person for the performance of services at or upon the airport necessary or desirable for the proper operation of the airport, including but not limited to, contracts for furnishing food and lodging, sale of aviation fuels, furnishing of aircraft repairs and other aeronautical services, and such other services as may be necessary or desirable for the traveling public. No such contract shall extend for a period of longer than 10 years and the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to such contracts or the leases authorized under section 5 hereof.

SEC. 7. Any executive department, independent establishment, or agency of the Federal Government or the Territory of Alaska, for the purposes of carrying out this act, is authorized to transfer to the Administrator, upon his request, any lands, buildings, prop-

erty, or equipment under its control and in excess of its own requirements which the Administrator may consider necessary or desirable for the construction, care, operation, maintenance, or protection of the airport.

SEC. 8. Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any rule, regulation, or order issued by the Administrator under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$500 or to imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 9. Unless the context otherwise requires, the definitions of the words and phrases used in this act shall be the definitions assigned to such words and phrases by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

SEC. 10. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$8,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, said appropriation to remain available until expended. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from year to year such sums as may be necessary for the proper maintenance, protection, control, and operation of said airport or as may be otherwise necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

This bill authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Administration to construct and operate an airport in the Territory of Alaska. It will be located at Anchorage. It has the support of the Departments of National Defense and Interior, and by the Air Coordinating Committee. It had the unanimous support of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The need for this airport is occasioned by—

First. Inadequacy of the existing field to handle the tremendously increasing volume of traffic;

Second. The obsolescence and practically complete destruction of the value of the field now in existence owing to the construction by the Air Force of a large military base adjacent to the existing field;

Third. The use of the field as alternate field for the military in case of an emergency;

Fourth. The inability of locally financing of the field, even under the Federal Airport Act, owing to territorial bonding restrictions.

The report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the subject of development of transportation in Alaska is one that is comprehensive and shows the need of additional airport facilities, especially at Anchorage in the Territory. I call your attention to this report that it may have the attention its importance entitles it to have. Only with the coming of aviation to the Territory, Alaska commenced again to forge forward. By 1940 its population was up some 12,000 from 1930, and it is now estimated as being somewhere around eighty-five to ninety thousand people, exclusive of the military, or nearly double the white population of 1930. During the 5-year period, 1941-45, its commercial shipments to the United States were nearly double those of the 1931-35 period and slightly exceeded the 1916-20 annual average, or \$68,926,416. Commercial shipments from the United States averaged \$74,235,049, although all of this cannot be attributed of course to the civilian population.

Air transportation has played a more important part in the transportation services of Alaska than it has in any other region of the United States. Within Alaska it has brought areas in contact with one another which heretofore were reached only after tedious overland musing by dog sled. It has overcome the isolation of those coastal towns reached only once or twice a year by water vessel. It has given year-round transportation to interior places which were shut off with the close of the short navigation season. It has opened up places never before reachable by any earlier means of transportation.

Between Alaska and the outside, air transportation has furnished speedy and efficient contact. There are now 35 air carriers within and between the Territory and the States. During a recent 4-month period an average of 61 flights a week departed from Seattle for Alaska. In addition, Anchorage is now a principal stop on Northwest Airlines' route between Minneapolis, Edmonton, and the Orient. During the last year the passengers carried in Alaska aircraft operations numbered 121,956, or more than 1 passenger for every permanent inhabitant, whereas domestic air travel in the United States is only 1 revenue passenger for every 15 inhabitants. Total miles flown were 7,663,264 in transporting these passengers some 38,233,117 passenger-miles and in carrying 8,636,126 pounds of freight and 2,445,111 pounds of mail.

CONTINUING IMPORTANCE OF AVIATION

Aviation is destined to remain dominant in the transportation system of Alaska. In many respects air transportation both within the Territory and between it and the States and the Orient has just passed the developmental stage and is just now in the process of real expansion. It does not appear to the committee that this dominance is likely soon to be challenged, regardless of the attention properly due to other means of carriage and travel. In the first place, the distances are so vast, the obstructions of terrain and weather are so rugged, that the plane possesses an inherent utility which cannot competitively be denied. Apart from certain roadway construction obviously needed and desirable, it also appears that the cost of new highway or railway construction to perform the service so adequately rendered by aviation in many communities would be prohibitive.

It should also be borne in mind that in Alaska the plane has not the same rate competition as it may have in other regions. Within Alaska it is clear that for many communities the competition afforded bulk movement of freight and passengers by winter overland route, by short-term river transportation, or by small steamer, is negligible. The climate is such and the roads too few to loom large in the picture. Currently also, for many other communities under the present road-building program, contact other than by air is some years away. For those areas adjacent to the railroad, air has and will continue to haul a substantial portion of the trade. The rail rates on the one hand are so high that there is not the competitive

air disadvantage, and the rail service on the other has been somewhat intermittent and impeded by heavy snow and ice blockades.

Between Alaska and the States, aviation also has less stringent economic competition than it may have elsewhere. There is no all-rail route to Alaska, the nearest transcontinental railroad ending at Prince Rupert, British Columbia, close to the southern tip of the southeastern Panhandle. The highway built during the war between the terminus of the Northern Alberta railroad at Dawson Creek, and the interior of Alaska, is the first land route to the Territory. Its use is now restricted, although during the maritime strike of last winter it provided a valuable transportation adjunct enabling the people of the North to avoid complete business paralysis and starvation. The Haines cut-off to the Alaska Highway affords a shorter and less costly water-truck route to the interior, but it also is not fully open. The general belief in the Territory is that the water rates are too high, or the combination water-rail rates, and the service far from adequate or continuous. Frequent and sometimes lengthy strikes have tied up shipping to the extent that resort has not only been had to air during such interruption, but continued thereafter as new channels of trade, especially direct ones with the Midwest, have been formed.

The utility and competitive economy of the plane in civil transportation are accompanied by considerations of national defense. In a Territory so large, so hewn by nature, and so populated, it is apparent that aviation has a paramount role in defense. Facilities are necessary for this purpose, and their maintenance naturally permits of the continuing and favorable operation of civil aircraft. Conversely, the development, maintenance, and expansion of civil aircraft accompanying facilities, and personnel are great aids to the defense program.

CIVIL AVIATION FACILITIES

The initiation of a Federal airways system in Alaska during the war and the improvements in the general economic position of the Territory have brought about a system of air-line schedules between the major points. Such schedules are operated over 9,908 carrier-route-miles.

In addition, there are 5,961 carrier-route-miles on which scheduled mail service as well as passenger and goods carriage, is provided to numerous small localities. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has established some 8,325 miles of airways, operates 17 major and 16 intermediate airfields, and operates and maintains radio range stations, other communication stations, and air-traffic-control centers and towers as aids to air navigation. In addition, the Territorial board of road commissioners maintains some 170 smaller landing strips built as Territorial aid to aviation.

However, except for southeastern Alaska, where seaplane equipment is largely used, the problem of providing adequate landing facilities has and is a very difficult one. As long as planes of small capacity and low landing speeds were the rule, the situation was not too troublesome, and depended greatly on

the skill of the pilot operators in utilizing a river bar or small clearing. The trend toward larger and faster aircraft entirely unsuited for bush operations is rendering unsuitable these antiquated makeshifts in numerous places, and with some of the modern equipment now being employed even the existing major airfields are unusable.

This situation is particularly acute at the city of Anchorage. Its Merrill municipal field was splendidly conceived and suitably constructed, being adequate to handle not only the type of plane in use at the time of their construction, but also the large number of DC-3 type aircraft making its appearance at the close of the war. Recent replacement by Pan American of DC-3's with DC-4's, the inauguration by Northwest Airlines of service to the Orient through Anchorage from Seattle and Minneapolis with DC-4 aircraft, and DC-4 flights by Alaska Air and Pacific Northern, however, have demonstrated that even this field is now obsolete for this type of aircraft and larger types are following. Some 44 flights scheduled a week into Anchorage represent operations with large equipment. More than half of these are operated with four-engine aircraft, which cannot be handled on the municipal field and are operated from the adjacent Elmendorf military field.

The international phase of these operations deserves brief additional emphasis. Anchorage is both a certified traffic point and an essential operational point on the Northwest Airlines' new service to the Orient. The three round trips a week which represent the initial service on this operation are expected to increase at least 100 percent in number by the end of this year and are projected from 30,000 passengers this year to 385,000 passengers 10 years hence. In due course we may expect as well some service by foreign air carriers from the Orient to the United States via Anchorage. Under the terms of the bilateral air transport agreement with China, air services of that nation may be operated via the Aleutians and Alaska. No such services have as yet been initiated, but when they come, they will represent an additional demand for landing facilities in Alaska capable of handling the largest type of transport aircraft.

It should also be noted that in addition to change in type of aircraft operated into Merrill Field, total activity at this field has also increased. Operations during the months of this year have been approximately 50 percent higher than those of last year, and follow the general averages of all airports in such respect. Total activity at this field measured in terms of operations handled by the control towers, puts it well up on the list of the towers operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Operations of all kinds for the two fiscal years ended June 1947 at Anchorage were 183,501. These may be compared with such fields as La Guardia at New York with 361,374, Chicago Municipal with 370,435, Washington National with 343,554, or Dallas Love with 316,345. The Alaskan fields, however, show a relatively greater activity in the summer months, with operations for the month of June 1947, at

Anchorage being 15,195, compared with 15,674 at La Guardia, 21,740 at Chicago, 15,313 at Washington, and 9,905 at Dallas. Indeed of all the towers operated by the Administration, 82 showed less operations handled than Anchorage, while 38 showed more; compared with 60 less than Anchorage and 41 greater in June 1946.

Obviously such data are indicative only and not of themselves conclusive, for the kind and size of plane involved vary in the figures given. Air carrier planes, for example, are a much smaller proportion of the total operations at Merrill than the other four fields named, but a larger proportion than in those of many other airports in the data; whereas military planes do not land at these Alaska fields but are operated in substantial number into some of the other airports.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FACILITIES

For some time the military has pointed out the increased use of its own facilities which it was making at Elmendorf (Anchorage) field, owing to general consolation and reorganization of its wartime bases in Alaska, and the fact that the increased use by the civil aircraft was not only taxing the total field operations but was and would hamper the military uses. The War Department, accordingly, last year indicated that during this year it would be compelled for reasons of national security to bar nonmilitary aircraft from this field. In view of the expressed interest in securing a new municipal field, the Department has temporarily postponed these dead lines, but is of the opinion it cannot long continue to do so.

The citizens of Anchorage have been impressed with the gravity of the situation and have energetically attempted to meet the need for development of adequate facilities for the larger equipment. They have been precluded from enlarging the existing field for any extension of runways to accommodate the larger aircraft or other expansion of the field to handle increased operations is impossible. Even under current conditions this field has been made partially unusable and hazardous owing to its proximity to the military field, being directly in the traffic pattern of the adjacent military field and so close to it that the Army itself regards the municipal field as hazardous to its own operations.

From the testimony of numerous competent witnesses at the committee hearings, and from examination at the localities themselves by members of the committee, it is apparent that the only solution is one of construction of a completely new field at Anchorage. From this same testimony and examination, the committee is of the opinion that neither the Territory nor the city is financially able—under the Territorial bonding strictures and under present construction outlays—to construct the requisite field. Regardless of the judgment exercised or reasons prompting the decision to locate the military fields in such close proximity to the municipal field, such location was done, and large installations made. It appears, accordingly, that a large contributing factor to the obsolescence of the municipal field has been an arm of the Government

itself, which thus has vitiated the investment which the cities have made in their facilities over a long period of years.

On these various grounds of local need, of international operations, and of governmental impairment of the value of the sites of the existing fields, the committee is convinced of the validity of its recommendations in connection with H. R. 3510, that the new field be constructed. In addition, military leaders both here and in Alaska, as well as numerous public officials, have pointed out that the national-defense needs of the Territory are so great that the standby facilities supplied by this additional civil field would be of inestimable value to those charged with the defense responsibility in the event of an emergency arising. The committee is of opinion that there is sufficient overriding national interest in the economy of the Territory and in air transportation in particular to justify a departure from existing policy with reference to joint local and Federal participation in the construction and operation of airports. I am in full accord with this view.

I sincerely hope that the membership of the House will recognize the importance of providing this additional airport facility, and will give the pending bill the support its importance entitles it to have.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House, H. R. 3510, would provide a link of immeasurable strength to the international air transportation chain of the United States. That bill calls for construction of an international airport in Alaska. From all studies made by responsible persons, the site of that airport would be at Anchorage.

Under the terms of this bill the Civil Aeronautics Administrator would construct, operate, and maintain a public airport "large enough for air commerce of the United States serving Alaska and foreign countries by way of Alaska points." The Administrator could acquire land, not to exceed 5,000 acres, through purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise, for the airport. The bill further provides that the Administrator could lease, for periods not over 10 years, space or property within or upon the airport for purposes essential or appropriate for the operation of the airport, and he would be permitted to enter into contracts for the performance of services at the airport in the way of food, lodging, sale of fuel, and so forth, for periods not longer than 10 years.

Any buildings, lands, or property under the jurisdiction of any department, independent establishment or agency of the Federal Government could be transferred to the jurisdiction of the CAA Administrator if found to be in excess to the needs of such department, establishment, or agency for use in connection with the airport.

An appropriation in the amount of \$8,000,000 would be authorized to carry out the purposes of the bill to be available until expended.

Hearings on H. R. 3510 were held on July 16 of last year in Washington by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and were continued last summer in Alaska when members of that

committee traveled to the Territory to study the transportation problems of Alaska. The measure has the unqualified support of that committee, the War Department, the Interior Department, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Air Coordinating Committee. And for excellent reasons.

Over a number of years Anchorage has spent considerable sums of money in building and developing its municipal airport at Merrill Field. Under ordinary circumstances Anchorage could expand the present airport for the ever-increasing needs of intra-Alaska airplane business. But circumstances are not ordinary. The present field cannot be expanded because of the proximity to the Army Establishment, known as Elmen-dorf Field. That field was built for and used in the national defense of our country. It lies a little over 2 miles from Merrill Field. The Army has found it absolutely imperative to announce that it must withdraw permission for civilian aviation to use its field, as the expansion of the air transportation to, within, and through Alaska to the Orient will make operations of both Army and civilian aircraft hazardous. One consideration of many for the decision forced upon the Army is based upon reciprocal agreements with foreign countries in international air travel which will call for landing privileges in Alaska in exchange for landing privileges extended our carriers in foreign countries, and it is readily recognized that landing on a military field would not be conducive to our best interests.

Without enactment of this bill, Anchorage would be without a commercial field large enough for the expanding needs of international air travel of which Anchorage is now the hub in Alaska. The Government, in establishing a new international air route to the Orient, picked Anchorage as the main stop on the Great Circle route. Certificates of convenience and necessity have been issued and passengers are now traveling from the United States to the Orient by way of Anchorage. Adequate air facilities in Alaska are of vast importance to that international travel in which the United States is so active a participant. The further development of that travel is significant to the United States for strategic, economic, cultural, and social reasons, all reasons readily understood and applauded. The Civil Aeronautics Board has estimated that as high as 75 percent of all American air-lines travel to the Orient will be flown via Alaska. It is anticipated that by 1957, 375,000 passengers a year will fly this route. Anchorage is now a certified and essential stop in those operations, and, in fact, for logical reasons was chosen as that stop. In 1940, trade with Asia amounted to \$1,500,000,000, and it cannot be denied that air transportation will cause substantial increases in that trade.

Anchorage is a major center of population, transportation, and trade distribution in the Territory. It depends largely upon air transportation for the movement of goods to carry on industry to supply the people not only in its vicinity but over wide areas of Alaska. It is

an essential air-base link with overseas and continental points. At the last census, Anchorage had 3,495 persons residing there, and in eight short years that population has expanded to an estimated 16,000. Anyone who really understands the picture does not scoff at the predictions that within 5 years Anchorage will have a population of 50,000. And Anchorage is literally leaping ahead in the expansion of industry. It is a prime distribution center for the major portion of traffic flowing between the continental United States and Alaska. It is the Army headquarters in the Territory, the base of the Alaska Railroad, and a center of the Territory's highway center. Weather conditions are most favorable. Its selection as the site of the contemplated international airport is ideal.

A report rendered in 1947 by the Civil Aeronautics Administration listed Anchorage's Merrill Field in forty-sixth place out of 121 airports throughout the Nation in the number of air operations. In many months of 1947 Anchorage exceeded such places as Buffalo, Boston, Akron, Dallas, Great Falls, Honolulu, Philadelphia, Portland, Oregon, San Diego, and other places and at times the Chicago Municipal Airport. In September of 1944 the number of flights at that field exceeded the number at LaGuardia in New York and Boeing Field in Seattle for the same period.

The establishment of the international airport at Anchorage is one of Government responsibility. Since Alaska is not yet a State, Congress has the special power and duty in the protection not only of the national interest but of the local interest in Alaska.

The Government's interest in Alaska's importance as an air center is reflected in establishment of an Alaska subcommittee of the Air Coordinating Committee which was set up because of the intense interest of executive agencies in the economic development of the Territory and the importance of Alaska to the development of air commerce with the Orient. The economic factors accompanied by national defense considerations have given Alaska special importance from the aviation point of view.

Civil aviation started in Alaska in 1924. The airplane is used on a wider scale in Alaska than anywhere else in the United States. Twenty-five persons out of every 1,000 in the United States use an airplane a year as compared with approximately 723 out of every 1,000 in Alaska. It is the only means of transportation in much of the Territory, and has gained the trust and respect of almost every single resident in Alaska. Air transportation has played a more important part in the transportation services of Alaska than it has in any other region of the United States. The airplane brings vast areas in close touch with one another and eliminates to a great degree isolation within Alaska's 586,000 square miles. It is the common mode of transportation. Extraordinary use has been made of the airplane which has contributed so much to Alaska's development. There are now some 35 air carriers operating within and between the Territory and the States. In 1934,

then Lieutenant Colonel Arnold—later General Arnold—stated he had to come to Alaska to really find a place where air transportation is taken as a matter of course and has become a necessary adjunct to the economic life of the country.

The provisions of H. R. 3510 would result in enduring benefits, not only to Alaska but to the whole United States, as the aviation problem in Alaska is one of national concern. Such an international airport would augment the Military Establishment in Alaska.

A little over 3 years ago a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee visited Alaska and stated that the airplane "is beyond question largely the solution of Alaska's transportation problem. The advantage would not only be for the benefit of the people of Alaska but for the benefit of all the people throughout the United States."

Civilian air carriers have the responsibility of providing the development of air transportation which is clearly needed, both from the standpoint of our civilian economy and the national defense. The Government has the primary responsibility of furnishing facilities for the maintenance and development of adequate air transportation in establishing an international airport at Anchorage. In that way the Government, in recognizing its duty, would provide the facilities to enable this country to maintain its dominant position in the field of international air transportation.

There is no real need to emphasize the fact here, but it is obvious that an international airport of the type contemplated would be an invaluable adjunct to the armed services. We cannot have too many airports there. They constitute the base for the entire defensive program in Alaska which is of such high importance to this Nation. Likewise obvious is the need for an international airport for civilian use as contrasted with purely military use. We have not yet forgotten—and I hope we shall never forget—the part played in prosecution of World War II by our civilian air-transport system. Especially in Alaska, so close to the shores of Asia, is there an urgent need to keep that system strong and to make it ever stronger.

I hope the House will pass H. R. 3510. It has the support of the Departments of National Defense and the Interior. It had the unanimous support of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOURLY MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ARNOLD and Mr. HAND asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (at the request of Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania), for the rest of the week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD), for today, on account of illness.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 408. An act for the relief of Lawson Ashby and others;

H. R. 431. An act for the relief of Columbia Hospital, South Carolina;

H. R. 621. An act for relief of Vera Frances Elicker;

H. R. 697. An act for relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin and others;

H. R. 993. An act for relief of the estate of Norman C. Cobb and others;

H. R. 1131. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of Charles L. Baker;

H. R. 1139. An act for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz);

H. R. 1152. An act for relief of Mrs. Inga Patterson, widow of F. X. Patterson;

H. R. 1298. An act for relief of Anastasio Panage Ionnatos;

H. R. 1654. An act for relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Campbell;

H. R. 1864. An act for relief of Mrs. Ralford D. Smith;

H. R. 1929. An act for relief of Edwin Os-good Cogan and others.

H. R. 2012. An act for relief of Mrs. Pearl Cole;

H. R. 2161. An act to amend the Synthetic Liquid Fuel Act;

H. R. 2268. An act for relief of Charles E. Crook and B. L. Fielder;

H. R. 2293. An act to amend the Great Lakes Navigation Regulation Act;

H. R. 2373. An act for relief of Stanley-Yelverton, Inc.;

H. R. 2374. An act for relief of Nita H. Stanley;

H. R. 3742. An act for relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling;

H. R. 3964. An act for relief of Thomas D. Sherrard;

H. R. 3973. An act relating to compensation of commissioners for Alaska;

H. R. 4331. An act for relief of Bertha M. Rogers;

H. R. 4541. An act for relief of Jesse F. Cannon and others;

H. R. 4570. An act for relief of Howard A. Yeager;

H. R. 4980. An act relating to acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, Mont., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3936. An act to authorize Park Police to make arrests in District of Columbia environs; and

H. R. 3175. An act to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned to meet tomorrow, March 11, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1378. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army or his duly authorized representative to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1379. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting two drafts of proposed bills, first, to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; second, to permit Federal savings and loan associations to convert into savings and loan type institutions under State law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1380. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a map entitled "Principal Natural Gas Pipe Lines in the United States and Communities Served With Natural, Manufactured, and Mixed Gas, 1947"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 144. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to have printed additional copies of a special subcommittee report and appendix on the United States Information Service in Europe; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 143. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to reduction of individual income

taxes held before the Committee on Ways and Means; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 142. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 4 and 5 of the hearings relative to revenue revisions, 1947-48, held before the Committee on Ways and Means; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1547. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 1306. An act relating to the construction and disposition of the San Jacinto-San Vicente aqueduct; without amendment (Rept. No. 1548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 499. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5470. A bill to repeal subsection (b) of section 3 of the act of December 30, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1549). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 155. Concurrent resolution to continue the Joint Committee on Housing beyond March 15, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1550). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH. Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5122. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5795. A bill to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5796. A bill relating to the functions of the General Accounting Office under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5797. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to transfer and convey certain property to the city of High Point, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5798. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 5799. A bill to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 5800. A bill to appropriate \$800,000 for the construction of a building at Knoxville, Iowa; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5801. A bill to authorize the payment of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry for overtime duty performed at establishments which prepare virus, serum, toxin, or analogous products for use in the treat-

ment of domestic animals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5802. A bill to provide for the proper administration of laws providing relief and other benefits to former member of the armed forces of the United States and to the dependents of deceased former members of such forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 5803. A bill relating to the extension to transferors and transferees in nontaxable reorganization of unused excess-profits credit carry-overs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 5804. A bill to authorize the Director of the Census to furnish information to individuals for certain purposes without charge; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLACKNEY:

H. R. 5805. A bill to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 5806. A bill to extend veterans' preference benefits to the fathers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5807. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5808. A bill to continue on a permanent basis a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day-care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5809. A bill to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 5810. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TWYMAN:

H. R. 5811. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 60 days; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H. J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HESS:

H. Res. 498. Resolution inquiring into the sinkings and damage done to United States Army transports; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. KLEIN introduced a bill (H. R. 5812) for the relief of Alberta Manna, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1522. By the SPEAKER: petition of Mrs. Nora Kinney and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1523. Also, petition of the secretary, Fraternal Order of the Odd Fellows of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the colonial status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1524. Also, petition of Mrs. William Marcus, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1525. Also, petition of Arthur J. Bowen, Cassadaga, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1526. Also, petition of Mrs. Mary E. Duxbury, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1527. Also, petition of Ruey E. Collins, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Christ, who givest peace to every believing heart, bestow that gift upon us now, for we are troubled and uneasy. Events in our world take away our hope and shatter our peace. We need to be reassured that peace is still possible and that God's will shall yet be done upon the earth.

We believe that God's judgments are sure and altogether right, but we do wonder how long Thou wilt suffer godless men to defy Thee and to destroy the dreams Thou hast planted in human hearts. May we trust, not in bombs, however powerful, but in Thee, in Thy might, in Thy love, in Thy plan, and in our secret weapon, the prayers of them that love Thee. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 10, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2744. An act to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air